

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XXII.

JULY, 1918.

No. 3.

---

## THE SYMBOLISM OF THE LUTHERAN CULTUS.\*

Divine worship in the Christian Church is not an *adiaphoron*. The Lord expressly commands that His Word be heard, John 8, 47. He has only severe censure for those who forsake the Christian assemblies, Heb. 10, 25. He expressly enjoins public prayer, 1 Tim. 2, 1. 2. 8. He graciously promises His divine presence at such assemblies, Matt. 18, 20. He records with approval the public services of the early Christians, Acts 2, 42—47.

But though He has prescribed the *general* content of public worship, though He is present in the sacramental acts of divine service, declaring and appropriating to the believers the means of grace, and though He graciously receives the sacrificial acts of the assembled congregation, in confession and prayer and offerings, He has not commanded a definite form or order of divine service. It is a matter of Christian liberty whether a congregation wishes one or many prayers, one or several

---

\* In addition to the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, the following books were consulted: Alt, H., *Christlicher Kultus*. Berlin, 1851. Cooper, F. E.; Keever, E. F.; Seegers, J. C.; Stump, J., *An Explanation of the Common Service*. Philadelphia, 1912. Daniel, H., *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae*. Lipsiae, 1847—1853. Fuerbringer, L., *Leitfaden fuer Vorlesungen, Liturgik*. St. Louis, 1915. Gueranger, L. P., *The Liturgical Year*. Vol. I. Worcester-London, 1895. Horn, E. T., *Outlines of Liturgics*. Second Edition. Philadelphia, 1912. Kliefoth, Th., *Liturgische Abhandlungen I*. Schwerin und Rostock, 1854. Kliefoth, Th., *Die urspruengliche Gottesdienstordnung*. Bd. 5. Schwerin, 1861. Lochner, F., *Der Hauptgottesdienst der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. St. Louis, 1895. Synodalbericht, Nebraska, 1898, 1903. THEOL. QUART., I, VII.

hymns, one or two sermons or homilies, whether the chief assembly be held in the morning or in the evening, whether the service be held on Sunday or on a ferial day.

To argue from these facts, however, that it is a matter of complete indifference as to how the form of Christian worship is constituted would be bringing liberty dangerously near to license. The Lord says: "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14, 40; and again: "Let all things be done unto edifying," v. 26. It cannot really be a matter of indifference to a Christian congregation when the order of service used in her midst shows so much similarity to a heterodox order as to confuse visitors. One may hardly argue that such *adiaphora* do not matter one way or the other, when it has happened that a weak brother has been offended. And a Lutheran congregation cannot justly divorce herself, not only not from the doctrinal, but also not from the historical side of its Church. It is a matter of expediency, as well as of charity and edification, that every Lutheran pastor and every Lutheran congregation have outward significant symbols of the inner union, of the one mind and the one spirit.

In addition to these facts, there is the further consideration that the outward acts of the Church, commonly known by the appellation "the liturgy," have a very definite significance, which, in many cases, renders the acts of public service true acts of confession of faith. And the symbolism of many of the Lutheran sacred acts, if correctly performed, is such that the beauty of these treasures of our Church may be brought to the joyful attention of our congregations.

This is true especially of the morning worship in the Lutheran Church, commonly known as The Service or The Communion. For this is not, as some people have supposed, a haphazard combination or a fortuitous conglomeration of heterogeneous material, but an artistic unit with definite and logical parts, a "spirituo-psychological, well-ordered, and articulated whole," as Lochner says (*Der Hauptgottesdienst*, 41). The order of service is a beautiful work of art, presenting



a gradual climax of such wonderful dignity and impressiveness that the mere presence in such a service should result in the edification of the faithful.

The service opens most appropriately with the Confession of sins. There is no better explanation of this preparatory step than that given by Augustine *In enarratione ad Psalm. CXIX*, when he writes: "Intrate in portas eius in confessione. In portis initium est; a confessione incipite. Unde in alio psalmo dicitur: Incipite Domino in confessione. Et quia? Quum iam intraverimus non confitebimur? Semper confitere; semper habes quod confitearis." (Daniel, *Codex liturgicus*, 1, 23.) Having made his confession and having been given the first assurance of the forgiveness of God, the believer enters into the Lord's presence.

He is now greeted by, and, in most cases, takes part in, the Introit of the day. It makes him acquainted with the special character and idea of the day, and he answers with the *Gloria Patri*, the confession of the coeternal Godhead of our Lord and the Holy Ghost with the Father.

Standing now within the portals of the temple, the congregation lifts up its voice in the *Kyrie*. This has been explained as follows: "The congregation, realizing its infirmity from indwelling sin, calls upon God for that grace which has been announced and offered in the Introit." (Explanation of the Common Service, 27. 28.) Since, however, such a confession at this point would interrupt the sequence of thought in the service, it is preferable to say with Horn (*Liturgics*, 61) that "the *Kyrie* is not specifically a confession of sin, but a cry of need," and with Lochner (l. c., 111), that the *Kyrie* is the common, humble confession of the entire misery and woe of the human race, on account of which God's only-begotten Son became man. For this wonderful deed Christ and the entire Godhead is then greeted and proclaimed in the *Gloria in excelsis*, the angels' hymn of glory, sung for the first time at Bethlehem and in use in the Church since the time of Hilarius Pictaviensis.

The words of humble entreaty and petition having now been spoken, and the sinner having been greeted with the assurance that his sins are fully and completely forgiven in and through Christ, to whom he has given joyful homage and adoration, he now joins with the entire congregation in the Collect. It will be well to quote Calvoer here, who writes of this prayer: "Praemittere solet sacerdos collectis: Oremus! Excitatur hoc ipso fidelis populus ad comprecandum devote, neque hoc solum, sed ut populus quoque sciat, quae sint sua et quae sint sacerdotis solius partes, ut quando simul orare, quando vero sacerdotis functionibus in sacro silentio attendere debeat. Legit enim minister ecclesiae, concionatur, consecrat eucharistiam, distribuit eam accedente verbo ad elementum, dimittit ecclesiam cum benedictione, in quibus coetus collectus non tam se habet active quam passive, non simul haec talia cum ministro peragens, sed recipiens haec sacra potius ab eodem, ipsa sacerdotalia mera relinquens. At in collectis, quum sint totius collectae aut coetus preces, jungit suam operam populus; quae cum omnia rite ac ordine peraguntur, acclamat sacerdos populo: Oremus!" (In Kliefoth, *Die urspruengliche Gottesdienstordnung*, 5, 29.) It is therefore entirely correct for an old Agenda to explain: "Collecta dicitur oratio, in qua sacerdos totius populi vel ecclesiae necessitates et pericula, seu vota et desideria, quasi collecta, Deo repraesentat; unde dicit: Oremus, quasi adstantes invitet ad hanc orationem adjunctis votis animisque faciendam." The Collect also serves to concentrate the thought of the Epistle and Gospel.

For now the Lord comes to the congregation in His Word. In the Epistle, which contains primarily doctrine and admonition, His apostles address the faithful, and in the Gospel the great signs and miracles of our Lord are proclaimed, or He speaks to us in His own words. Very properly, therefore, the congregation stands before Him in meek and humble devotion, responding to the Epistle with the Hallelujah or a hymn embodying the great Gospel-news of the day, and to the Gospel with the recital of the Creed in chorus.



Having thus publicly stated their acceptance of the truth of God's Word, the faithful are prepared for the next great part of the service, the Sermon, with its application of the doctrines contained in the lessons *de tempore* to their hearts and minds. It is the first part of the great climax of the service, the recital of the wonderful deeds of God for the salvation of fallen mankind or the earnest admonition of the faithful to lead lives commensurate with the exalted state of the elect of Christ. The congregation answers with the Offertory or Offering, accepting the doctrines that have been proclaimed, and vowing faithfulness to the Lord with all their heart and soul.

It is a mistake to assume, with Kliefoth, that The Service is properly divided into the sacramental act of the Word and that of the Communion. The old Lutheran liturgists very properly called the whole service The Communion, and though the celebration of the Lord's Supper is, in a way, the culmination of the service, since only the actual adult members of the church are permitted to partake of the heavenly meal, yet the means of grace are on the same level. The Eucharist is the second part of the great climax. The audible Word is supplemented by the visible Word. The faithful having received the assurance of the grace of God in the sermon, they now become partakers of that meal in which assurance is made doubly sure, being supplemented by the body and blood of the Savior, sacramentally received.

This miracle requires adequate preparation, and so, after the conclusion of the Church Prayer, which is made from the altar as the place of prayer, the faithful lift up their hearts in a prayer of thanksgiving, the Eucharistic Prayer, for God's unspeakable mercies. The prayer is followed by one of the most impressive hymns of praise, the Holy, Holy, Holy. The Consecration having been introduced with the Lord's Prayer and consummated with the Words of the Institution, the administration of the Holy Supper takes place, while the congregation devoutly sings the *Agnus Dei*.

And now the believer, having received the final assurance

of pardon, joins with the congregation in the joyful hymn of Simeon: "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace." He prays with a thankful heart for strength to live as it becometh a disciple of Christ, and, having received the blessing of the Lord, goes back to his home rejoicing in the fruits of his salvation.

Just as the Service, however, is thus a beautiful and harmonious unit, with a symbolism whose full significance is unknown to, or not appreciated by, the majority of the churchgoers, because they have never been made acquainted with it, so also other acts of worship performed in the church have a meaning, which should be brought out by the ministrant. Properly interpreted and correctly understood, they become a source of pleasure to the congregation present, instead of wearying by the monotony of frequent repetition.

When Luther wrote his "Taufbuechlein verdeutscht," in the year 1523, he very properly retained the form in general use in the church, since the ceremonies prescribed in the various agendas were not in themselves wrong. The outward ceremonies, including the exorcism, the administration of salt, the Ephphatha-ceremony, and others, have since been omitted, but the text has been retained almost in its entirety. Thus also the symbolism of the form may well be preserved. Since ancient times the ceremony of baptism was divided into two parts. The renunciation and the profession of faith took place in the vestibule, "ad januas ecclesiae." Most of the English parish churches had north and south porches, which were used for this part of the ceremony. When the words had been spoken, "The Lord preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even forevermore," the celebrant, preceding the sponsors with the child, came into the church, where the rite of baptism was administered at the font, which stood near the entrance.

We still have the division of the act of baptism into two parts, and might well indicate the symbolism of the rite. The pastor may meet the sponsors with the child at the foot of the



chancel-steps, where the first part of the sacred act takes place. When the blessing of entrance has been spoken, the pastor should lead the sponsors with the child to the font, where the Sacrament is administered. Thus the symbolism is preserved. The child, having been born under the curse of inherited sin, and therefore subject to eternal death and damnation, is brought to the place where the mercy of God is dispensed in the means of grace. It is welcomed at the entrance of the chancel, and then taken into the place where the Lord of mercy gives the blessings of the Gospel through baptism, thus signifying its admission into the communion of the congregation.

The form of the marriage ceremony is similarly indicative of the doctrinal position of the Lutheran Church. According to Luther's "Traubuechlein fuer die einfaeltigen Pfarrherren" of 1534, the marriage ceremony was divided into two parts. The rite proper, the giving into wedlock, took place in the vestibule, "vor der Kirchen." Then the procession moved to the altar, where the reading of the lessons and the benediction were rendered. The symbolism of this original form, if applied to-day, is immediately apparent. Marriage is a thing of this world and is primarily under the jurisdiction of the State, "ein weltlich, irdisch Ding," as Luther so often points out. This fact is brought out by the rubric, according to which the rite of joining in wedlock was performed in the vestibule, in the porch, or before the doors. The solemnization and blessing of the marriage is, however, a matter of the church, and therefore takes place at the altar.

There is another circumstance to which attention should be called. According to the understanding of Scriptures, a valid betrothal is tantamount to a marriage *in foro ecclesiae*. It is far better, therefore, and liturgically the one correct thing, to have the bride and groom come to the altar together, to emphasize this fact. The form according to which the groom awaits the bride-to-be at the altar cannot be defended in a Lutheran church.

The original symbolism of the sacred act may also be retained, even in our days. If there be an address by the pastor,

he should meet the young people at the lowest step of the chancel and perform the joining in wedlock there. After that he should proceed to the altar, read the lessons, and pronounce the blessing over the bride and groom at the step of the altar. In case there be no address, the lessons ought to precede the act of marriage, which takes place at the entrance to the sanctuary, while the benediction is pronounced in the chancel, at the step of the altar.

St. Paul, Minn.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

---

## LUTHER AND ZWINGLI.

### A PARALLEL AND A CONTRAST.

---

#### 18.

"If ever monk got to heaven by his monkery, I, too, should have entered heaven," thus Luther in 1533 summed up his endeavors during his cloister-life. (19, 1845.) His efforts to attain to that spiritual condition which he ardently coveted can be compared to the frantic effort of a man who endeavors to lift himself out of a pit by his bootstraps. They told him to rely on his penitential exercises: his self-abasement before the confessor, his deep remorse, the works which he was doing from love of Christ would wipe out his guilt, increase his merit, fill his soul with peace, and swell his future reward. He felt none of these effects; on the contrary, his anguish became more keen, and the smittings of his conscience beggared description. (5, 564.) He mounted the altar-steps to read mass: he stood there in his unimpeachable canonical holiness, but at heart a miserable skeptic, and he left the altar a worse doubter. (12, 904.) He shuddered as he passed the crucifix. (7, 959.) The sting of death was in his soul. (8, 1347.) He would swoon away in terror at the thought that Christ, the inexorable Judge, was summoning him to the reckoning. (13, 1924.)

His pitiable condition was greatly aggravated by the solitary life which he was compelled to lead, and owing to the learned studies which he was pursuing he was more lonely



than the other monks. Even when he opened his heart to his confessor, he was not understood. One aged brother only seems to have had an inkling of what was going on in the mind of the young monk: he cut into the self-accusations of Luther with the reminder that the Creed commands us to believe the forgiveness of sin, that is, that God wants the individual sinner to be assured that his guilt has been canceled.

The best influence that was exercised on Luther during this period of internal stress and storm came from the superior of his order, Staupitz. Luther has called Staupitz his father in the doctrine of the Gospel, who begat him in Christ. (21 b, 3077.) An evangelical tendency is indeed noticeable in Staupitz. At first he, too, would shake his head when this strange young monk, whom he beheld prematurely aged by his monkish tasks and study, and bent with an invisible burden of sorrow, would pour out his grief before him. "Magister, I do not grasp you!" he would say; but in the conversations that ensued between them he would drop remarks which showed Luther a chink in the wall of his soul-prison through which rays of the light of grace fell into Luther's heart. Luther was startled by admissions which this man, whom he regarded as a great man in the Church, would make to him: "More than a thousand times," Staupitz told Luther, "I have promised God to become more upright, but I have never accomplished what I promised." (9, 688.) "I have lied to God more than a thousand times that I would be more pious, and I never did it." (8, 82.) "I shall cease vowing to be more godly; I have deceived our Lord God too often; I shall only ask God for a blessed end." (22, 507.) Here, at last, was a sympathetic soul, a brother in trials such as Luther had undergone. More fundamental points of doctrine were touched when Staupitz declared that man cannot satisfy the demands of the Law; his natural powers of will lead him first into presumptuousness and afterwards into despair. The Law says to man: Yonder is a high mountain which you must cross. Precocious man says: I will. Then the conscience interposes the warning: You cannot. Finally, despairing, man says:

I give it up. At this stage, however, the rock appears on which the despairing sinner can gain a safe footing and find shelter; and that rock is Christ. An excellent portrayal of the pedagogy of saving grace!—They also discussed the doctrine of predestination. Luther had come to fear this doctrine, not by the difficulties which it presents to the inquiring and reasoning intellect, but by his moral condition. Staupitz, with consummate pastoral skill, told him: "In the wounds of Christ, and nowhere else, we find and grasp our predestination." He directed him to impress Christ fully on his mind, and he would find himself elected. For God has foreordained that His Son should suffer for sinners and not for the righteous. Whoever believes this is His beloved child, and those only are lost who disbelieve this truth. Staupitz also told Luther that in this way he had applied the doctrine of predestination in his own case, and disposed of all the perplexing questions which that doctrine raises when incorrectly handled. "When I consider the inexpressibly great blessings which God the Father in heaven has by His pure grace and mercy bestowed on me for Christ's sake, without any merit of mine, without my good works, or worthiness, and stop at this reflection, predestination is full of comfort, and a firm and immovable truth; if otherwise, everything is gone."

Staupitz was silently observing the young monk at his work among the brethren and over his tomes in the cell, and was forming plans regarding a sphere of greater usefulness that ought to be found for his unmistakable talents. On one occasion he revealed his thoughts to the despondent Luther somewhat by telling him: "You do not know how good and necessary these afflictions are for you; without them nothing good would become of you." Luther has declared the years which he spent in the cloister lost years of his life. (8, 168.) This is true in a certain respect: Luther might have been much more profitably employed during those years. But in another view those years were formative years for the future Reformer of the Church.



## 19.

Owing to the division of Saxony in 1485 between the Ernestine and the Albertine line of the ruling house, which had allotted Dresden and Leipzig to the latter, Ernestine Saxony, embracing the electoral precinct with Thuringia had remained without a university. The lack was supplied when Elector Frederick the Wise in 1502 chose Wittenberg, which was centrally located in the electoral precinct, as the site of a new university, and with imperial sanction founded the high school that was destined to become famous through its youngest professor. The Pope gave his approval later. The uninviting locality, meager endowments, and the plague, which had broken out soon after the university had begun its career, made its early years a continuous struggle for existence. Luther was called to this school on the suggestion of Staupitz, because "a vigorous, lively, inspiring professor" was required at the struggling school "in termino civilitatis," on the border of civilization, in a region that was not favorable for farming, and inhabited by poor folk. ("Laendiken, Laendiken, du bist ein Saendiken," Luther used to say playfully in later years when he looked out on the sand hills, in the midst of which the squalid little town of Wittenberg had been built up. 22, 115.)

In the fall of 1508—probably in November—Luther came to Wittenberg. He came with no ambitious plans and no program of revolutionizing the higher learning of the age. He came because he had no other choice, the rules of his order compelling him to any summons that he might receive from his superior. He came as an Augustinian monk; his shelter and physical needs were provided for at the convent which his order maintained at Wittenberg. He moved into the dormitory which had just been erected, and continued his monkish life as at Erfurt. The work at the university he did in addition to his ordinary tasks, and for this work he received no remuneration. The financial plans of the founders of the university had included this feature: professors were to be supplied from the order of Augustinians, because they required no salary.

Luther's first lectures were on philosophy: he expounded the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle and Dialectics, studies which he had for some time begun to detest. He keenly felt his insufficiency for the task. He compared himself to a student who takes up his first semester at a university, and is by his older fellow-students made to go through the act of "deposition," a farcical performance which is supposed to initiate a student fully into the academic fraternity. While grinding out the old pagan stuff of the Greek sage, as he regarded and called it later, Luther had his mind on theology. He attended the theological lectures of Trutvetter, Pollich, and Staupitz while teaching his own classes, and received the degree of Bachelor of Theology on March 9, 1509.<sup>1)</sup> In this new capacity exegetical work was required of him. He lectured one hour each day on a portion of the Scriptures. The famous wrestling with the correct interpretation of Rom. 1, 16 f., which had begun even at the cloister in Erfurt, was carried on with greater intensity here. Also into the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages Luther delved with redoubled energy.

Luther's aim was to take his next degree in theology, that of Sententiarius, within a year. He would then have been promoted to the dignity, dear to the heart of theologians of that age, of lecturing on the dogmatics of that great light of the Roman Church, Peter of Lombard. But this plan was thwarted by Luther's sudden recall to Erfurt. The exact cause of this is not known; it seems to have some connection with internal troubles in the Augustinian order. By the rule of the order the convent at Erfurt where Luther had taken the vow had a special claim on him which he could not set aside. When the summons came to return to his first monkish domicile, he again had no choice but to obey. However, he came back to Erfurt as a uni-

---

1) There is a curious entry in the Dean's Book of the Wittenberg Faculty, in which all promotions to theological degrees are recorded. The entry says that Luther had not paid the Faculty the customary fee for his promotion. Years after, Luther came upon this entry and added the remark, "I had nothing!"



versity man. It is quite probable that the withdrawal of Paltz from Erfurt in 1507 had some connection with the recall of Luther. Hausrath even suggests that Luther's recall to Erfurt was to compensate that university for the loss of their great expounder of Lombard, Trutvetter, who had gone to Wittenberg. It is certain that Luther was not summoned merely to reenter the cloister.

Pedantic punctiliousness on the part of the authorities of the Erfurt school and small jealousies which they were harboring against the little academic upstart on the Elbe created annoying difficulties for Luther on entering upon his work at the university. Luther's academic status seemed to them hard to define; at any rate, they were unwilling to admit Luther's claims to academic efficiency for work in a certain degree. The rules of the Faculty required two years' work on the Bible before a Bachelor of Theology could apply for the degree of Sententiarius, though monks could be exempted from this rule and the term of two years could be reduced for them. Another rule required the applicant for a degree to begin and finish his preparation for that degree at the same university. The historians are not clear in their account how Luther became a Sententiarius. They are agreed that the degree must have been conferred on Luther at Erfurt, but there is also evidence that Luther came to Erfurt, probably in the fall of 1509, as Sententiarius. Koestlin solves the difficulty by saying that Luther had discharged the required "disputation"—equal to our modern examination—for the degree of Sententiarius while still at Wittenberg, and all that was still required when he left Wittenberg, was his formal promotion. The exact date when this occurred at Erfurt is not given.

The Weimar Edition of Luther's Works (Vol. 9, 28 ff. 2 ff.) has reproduced the marginal notes which Luther entered in his copy of the Sentences of Lombard, and in a volume containing writings of Augustine. Buchwald gives a facsimile of the title page of the latter volume, with Luther's indentures. There is no doubt that these notes were made during the period at

Erfurt, some of them perhaps at Wittenberg. Luther lectured on the Sentences three semesters at Erfurt. The two first books of the Lombard he most likely treated during the first year, and later, when he had become a "Sententiarius formatus," that is, a duly accredited Sententiarius, the third book. His notes reveal the deep interest in Rom. 1, 17, regarding the righteousness that is "from faith to faith." He attempts an explanation: following Augustine, for whom he expresses profound respect, he calls Christ our righteousness and sanctification. The light that we need for understanding divine things he proposes, with Hilary, to seek in the divine Word, not in the subtle dialectics which he sees many of his contemporaries favoring. But there is no hint of any conscious dissent from the authoritative teaching of the Church. The little critical freedom which the young professor exercised at this time was the privileged freedom of academicians of that age. It did not spell heresy.

Nevertheless, coupled with the nervous temperament that was noticeable in Luther at this time, it disturbed the pleasant relations with his colleagues at Erfurt. From the start they had accepted Luther's coming among them as a premature Sententiarius with a sort of sullen recognition. For years they showed their ill will against Luther in small ways: he had not paid the fee of the Sententiarius to them (the reason was the same as on the previous occasion at Wittenberg; besides, Luther questioned that it was due them); he ought to have taken his Doctor's degree at their university, etc. Moreover, these Erfurters were hide-bound Aristotelians, and when the young professor, whom they could not stomach anyway, displayed his contempt for the adored idol of medieval theology and the theological method of that age, and when in his public lectures and disputations he sometimes spoke of these matters in an irritated manner, the grave doctors were duly offended. We should remember that it was in this crowd of academic malcontents that Luther found his lifelong calumniator Oldecop, whose father confessor he had become, and that another crafty story-teller, Cochlaeus, obtained his information against



the naughty Luther, which he portrayed to his age, from this most unfavorable source of the circle of professors in the theological Faculty at Erfurt.

## 20.

Luther's journey to Rome is a most interesting chapter in his life, but it offers little to show that Luther was spiritually advanced by it. Reminiscences of what he had seen and heard at the seat of the Church's greatest power and glory were valuable to him later in his reformatory work, but for the time being he was at Rome and did as the Romans, except that he eschewed their profligacy. The net results of his spiritual gains he has summed up in a remark in a sermon in 1538: "I brought onions to Rome, and came back with garlic." (7, 1068.) That means, that he went to Rome on a fool's errand, and came back with a fool's prize. The only thing that he recalls with approval in later years was the administrative ability of the Roman Rota, the ecclesiastical office through which the Church's business connections with all parts of Europe were maintained.

The year of Luther's journey to Rome is still being debated, though the evidence that it occurred in the fall of 1510, probably in October or November, has been materially strengthened, if not placed beyond all doubt, by Boehmer's monograph *Luthers Romfahrt*. Luther's route of travel, too, both on the going and on the return trip, is not settled in detail. If it were exactly known, a little pleasant speculation might be indulged in, whether Luther did not on this trip pass through localities that were visited about a year later, or the same year, by Zwingli. The war of Louis XII for the possession of Milan had just been concluded, and the war of Pope Julius's II Holy Alliance against Venice had commenced, when Luther started Rome-ward. Swiss soldiers were in the French and later in the papal armies. The headquarters of the latter, until January 2, 1511, were at Bologna. These wars, as we shall see in a later chapter, brought Zwingli to Italy, in the capacity of army chaplain, in 1512, 1513, and 1515.

If Koestlin is right in placing Luther's journey to Rome

in the fall and winter of 1511—12, Luther returned to Wittenberg near the end of February, 1512; if the journey occurred a year earlier, he must have returned to Erfurt and continued his labors there. It is certain that he was in Wittenberg May 8, 1512. Various causes concurred to bring about his return to the university where he had begun his academic labors. Trutvetter had left Wittenberg and returned to Erfurt. Staupitz was preparing to withdraw from the Faculty, because his duties as Provincial of the Augustinian order just at this time seriously interfered with his duties as professor, and at his advanced age he felt that he did not possess the full strength necessary for teaching. However, the internal troubles in the Augustinian order also had something to do with Luther's return to Wittenberg, as they undoubtedly caused his journey to Rome. Staupitz had planned to amalgamate both the cloisters of the strict observance and the laxer ones. In this endeavor he was resisted by a number of German cloisters in Saxony and Bavaria. Luther also opposed him at first. It was to carry the complaint of the dissatisfied party to the Curia that Luther went to Rome. Afterwards he changed his mind, and sided with Staupitz, and now the brethren at Erfurt charged him and his friend Lang with defection. Conditions were made so unpleasant for the latter that he was transferred to Wittenberg in 1511, and assumed the teaching of the same branches which Luther had first taught there. Dr. Usingen has called Lang's removal to Wittenberg "going into exile." Cochlaeus has bitterly complained about Luther's "defection" to Staupitz, almost charging Luther with treason. Add to these causes the restored *entente cordiale* between Luther and Staupitz, and his removal to Wittenberg is fully explained. At Pentecost, 1512, Luther was at Cologne, where Staupitz was holding a chapter of the Augustinian convents, and where the troubles between the contending factions seem to have been composed, all the more since Staupitz may have permitted it to become known that he was heartily tired of his office as Provincial. "The first three years," he is reputed to have said, "I tried to run affairs



my own way, and did not succeed; then I conducted my office by the advice of the holy fathers and failed; lastly, I tried to let God conduct my affairs, and then I did not get along at all. It's time there were a new Provincial."

Luther's labors at Wittenberg were now entirely theological. "One might suppose," says Koestlin, "that he lectured on the Fourth Part of the Sentences during the summer semester of 1512, but there is nothing definitely known about this, nor about his general activity at the university at this time. Having made two of the academic degrees in the theological career, Luther must have looked forward to the last one, that of Doctor of Theology. However, when it was suggested to him that he must take this last step towards professional perfection in theology, he was startled and abashed. Again it was Staupitz who supplied the push for this step. In the account which Cordatus has given of this episode a number of reminiscences seem to have flown together. It was in the convent garden at Wittenberg. Staupitz was sitting in the shade of a pear-tree, buried in thought. Suddenly he addressed Luther: "Magister, you shall take the doctor degree; that will give you something to do." Luther protested: his strength was exhausted, he had not long to live. Staupitz kept urging: "Don't you know that our Lord has many and great affairs that must be attended to? He needs many prudent and wise men to help Him and to take counsel with Him." Luther continued to put the suggestion from him. "More than fifteen reasons," he relates, "I set up against becoming a doctor." Lastly, he exclaimed: "Doctor, you will kill me; I shall not live three months if I take the degree." Staupitz smiled and remarked humorously: "In God's name, then; our Lord has great business on hand; He needs smart men also in heaven. If you die, you will have to be His counselor there." (22, 634f.) Luther yielded "to coercion and constraint, and with no grateful heart." (16, 1700.) On September 22d he announced to the brethren at the convent in Erfurt that his promotion to the Doctor's degree would take place, in obedience to the order of their superior,

on October 18th. "God knows," he declared, "how little I deserve this high honor, and how little I appreciate it." (21 a, 5.) His former colleagues at the University of Erfurt were profoundly shocked to hear that a young man of twenty-eight years should receive the Doctor's cap, when at their school they created no one a Doctor under fifty years of age. (22, 665. This astonishment is one of the most robust and virile on record; it still lives. Rome has never recovered from it.) This time the expenses of the academic actus were duly defrayed by Elector Frederick, who thanked Luther in this practical manner for a sermon which he had heard from him, and which had made a deep impression on him by its spiritual force, oratorical power, and chiefly by its excellent contents. Rome has a more spicy explanation of the manner in which the expenses of Luther's promotion to the Doctor's degree were paid: Staupitz had received money from a noble lady for the promotion of another monk to the Doctor's degree. This money he filched to show Luther a favor. Decidedly a more dramatic version than the trite one noted before!

On October 21st Luther was received as a member of the theological senate, and on the same day the resignation of Staupitz was accepted. Staupitz was content to leave his work in the hands of his young *protégé*, and confident that the latter's talents would now be given the proper scope and development.

## 21.

The ten years which Zwingli spent as people's priest at Glarus, 1506—1516, have been sketched in a general way in chap. 11. Though active and energetic in the discharge of his pastoral functions, an assiduous student, and carefully cultivating his oratorical powers, so that he began to be mentioned as an impressive speaker, Zwingli spent a life of comparative ease in his beautiful Alpine parish. "Being convinced that the preacher needed every help available, he read widely in the classics, studied eloquence, and for purposes of pulpit illustration memorized Valerius Maximus, the Latin author who has so industriously collected anecdotes." His life was the con-

ventional life of a Catholic priest of those days, even *in puncto sexti*. It was an easy, pleasant life, and contained much more of the elements of social culture and refinement than ever fell to Luther's lot. It was at Glarus that Zwingli took up the study of Greek, which at that time was still in its infancy in Western Europe. Jackson mentions as Zwingli's text-book the *Erotemata* of Chrysoloras, who had died on Swiss soil a century before (at Constance, 1415). Zwingli's friend Loriti promised to send him a Greek dictionary from Basel in 1516. In a letter to another friend, Zwingli accounts for his taking up this study, which he began in earnest about 1513, as follows: "I do not know who has stirred me up to the study of Greek unless it is God; I do not do it on account of glory, for which I do not look, but solely for the sake of sacred literature." Zwingli also built up a remarkably fine private library during his pastorate at Glarus, partly out of the papal pension which he received since 1512. "He was deeply interested in the literary events of the day, and, like other friends of the New Learning, watched eagerly the printing-press to see what treasures it would bring forth." (Jackson, 77, 81 f. 89.)

It remains now to examine a few events in the life of Zwingli which indicate in what way he was reaching out beyond the confines of his parish to make his influence felt in the great world of affairs, and to note a few of the friendly connections which he found during this period.

It is significant of the general character of Zwingli as a reformer that his first reformatory efforts were made in the domain of the social and political life of the Swiss. He attempted to stop the ignominious "Reislaufen" of the Swiss youth, that is, the custom of hiring themselves out as mercenaries in armies of foreign potentates. True, there were religious considerations that prompted Zwingli's attack on this custom: the soldiers returning from a campaign with their pockets full of money and valuable booty exerted a demoralizing influence on the humble population and the quiet life of their native villages and towns. By their marvelous tales, their osten-



tatious display of wealth, their prodigality, and their habits of living they created discontent among the mountaineers with their lowly and simple life. They were also carriers of diseases which they had contracted abroad, and they spread lax views of religion, which they had imbibed chiefly in the papal campaigns. But more than by these plainly immoral symptoms, Zwingli was shocked by the estrangement of these soldiers from the national ideals of the Swiss Confederacy. They had grown away from the liberty-loving fatherland; they had become French Swiss, or Italian Swiss, or German Swiss; they were becoming denationalized. This observation roused the patriotic indignation of Zwingli. The evil became immeasurably aggravated in his eyes because in nearly every canton and in every large city in Switzerland there were well-to-do citizens and men in official stations who favored the practise of "Reislaufen" because it brought them considerable revenue. They would act as *agents procureurs*, now for the French king, now for the emperor, now for the Pope, whenever these needed soldiers for their armies. Some of them were permanently hired to act as recruiting agents, and were called by the inoffensive title of "pensionaries." They would also receive extra gifts for a specially large or efficient contingent of troops which they would furnish their masters. At the sessions of the cantonal diets disgraceful scenes would be enacted: the representatives of foreign powers would outbid each other to secure the military power of the Swiss for their masters, and prominent Swiss gentlemen would unblushingly sell their social and political influence to the highest bidder. This happened in the very town of Glarus, where Zwingli could observe it. The old Swiss honesty was being undermined; the Swiss came to be known as perfidious people, whose word could not be relied on.— We briefly touched upon this matter in chap. 1, but it has been necessary to give a fuller account of the existing state of affairs, in order that Zwingli's earliest reformatory actions may be understood, and he may be given such credit as is due him, but no more.

Out of the defensive wars which the Swiss had successfully waged against Burgundy and Germany towards the end of the fifteenth century, the Swiss Confederacy had sprung. It was justly proud of its independence. But Swiss bravery on the battlefield during these wars had also attracted the attention and roused the admiration of the neighboring nations. Where the Swiss banners were flying, there victory was supposed to perch. Everybody who had a war to wage began to court the favor of the Swiss: the Emperor of Germany, the King of France, the Italian dukes, the Senates of Italian republics, and, last not least, the Holy Father at Rome.

During 1500—4 there was a three-cornered conflict for the possession of the Duchy of Milan between Emperor Maximilian, King Louis XII, and Duke Louis Sforza of Milan. The rival bribes and mercenary fees which these contending parties offered the Swiss created scenes like those referred to before. The French king on this occasion bagged the game: the bulk of the Swiss soldiery accepted service under him, and with their aid Milan was taken, and in 1507 the Genoese were deprived of their independence and liberty. — The battle of Agnadello (May 14, 1509), where Louis XII crushed Venice, the sister republic of Switzerland was won with the aid of 6,000 Swiss. In this case the Swiss magistrates had protested against their taking service against a republic; they felt something of the turpitude which such service involved; but the love of lucre proved too powerful for their covetous countrymen, and that covetousness the magistrates themselves had nourished on previous occasions. — It is an old observation that rogues fly apart as easily as they fly together. After the Swiss Moor had performed his service for his French master, the Moor was told to go. Amid the taunts of their comrades of an hour ago and without wages the Swiss departed. But the arrogance and insolence of the French came to be felt by another ally, the Pope, who had with them formed the Holy Alliance, by which he hoped to bring recalcitrant Venice to terms. Pope Julius II concluded that he might not be able to rid himself of the spirits

which he had summoned to his aid, and hastily patched up an understanding with Venice in order to obtain a free hand against his ally, the French king, whom he first must drive from Italian soil. His crafty agents came into Switzerland and discovered that the Swiss politicians were dreading an alliance that might be formed against them by the emperor and the king, for they had on different occasions fought against both of them, although they had on other occasions fought for them. The papal agents worked on this fear, and with the powerful aid of Cardinal Schinner of Wallis, on March 13, 1510, concluded an alliance with the Pope. Schinner's cardinalate dates from this occasion, for it was the papal reward for his share in this transaction. The Pope now summoned 6,000 Swiss to invade Lombardy, and to demand free passage through the territory from the French to join the papal army. The French refused the free passage, destroyed the bridges to the south, massed their cavalry for an attack upon the Swiss from all sides, and at the same time offered the Swiss a bribe if they would retreat. Since the Swiss were out of provisions, the bribe was accepted, and the shameful retreat commenced. The angry curses of the Pope were speedily conveyed to the Swiss, but these had the effrontery to demand the payment of their wages from the Pope, and at the same time to admonish him to make peace, reminding him that "he ought to be a prince of peace and void of treachery." Still more incensed, the Pope now threatened to form an alliance against the Swiss, yea, to rouse all nations against them as traitors to the Holy See. Their wages they shall not receive until they have fulfilled their treaty obligations. Now fear seized the leaders of the Confederacy; they felt themselves surrounded by enemies, having lost their last friend in the Pope. Distrust of each other, factionalism, and disorders began their disintegrating work among them and to bring their political organization to the verge of dissolution.

At this psychological moment, in 1510, Zwingli came forward with his first literary product, two allegorical poems in Iambic verse, written in wretched German, "The Labyrinth"



and "The Fable of the Ox and Some Animals." There is no real worth in these productions; the copious introduction of mythological references in the former poem shut it out from the understanding of the common people. It is also doubtful whether the poems were given circulation. A Latin translation of one of them, which Zwingli had made for his friend Gla-reanus, was pronounced inferior by that humanist. But the poems show with what matters Zwingli at this time was occupying his mind, and for this reason we shall essay a synopsis of them.

In "The Labyrinth," after mentioning that structures thus named were known to have existed in Egypt, Italy, and Lemnos, Zwingli describes the structure which Daedalus erected near Candia, on the island of Crete, for King Minos (vv. 1—11). Here was confined the monstrous offspring of the wife of Minos, Pasiphae, who had cohabited with a bull and had brought forth the Minotaurus, a being half man, half beast (vv. 12—20). To this monster Minos fed captured Athenians, whom he thus punished for slaying his son Androgeos. The young hero Theseus, having already achieved several remarkable feats of valor, which make him the rival of Hercules, comes to Athens and visits King Aegeus. Being told of the shameful humiliation of the Athenians, he undertakes to liberate the stricken city (vv. 21—30). He goes to Crete, where Ariadne, the daughter of Minos, falls in love with him, and hearing of his intention to slay the Minotaurus and knowing of the bewildering maze of paths and cross-paths in the Labyrinth, in the deepest recesses of which the monster dwells, she hands Theseus a ball of thread, the end of which she bids him fasten near the entrance, and then unravel the ball as he penetrates the Labyrinth (vv. 31—60). As Theseus enters the cavernous building, the jarring door wakes echoes so awful that they sound as if the bellowing monster is rushing forward to meet his assailant; but Theseus advances undaunted along confusing paths, and is suddenly startled by terrible apparitions along the walls of the corridors through which he is walking (vv. 61—78). He sees

a fierce lion glaring at him with one eye; but walking up to him courageously, he discovers that it is a painted lion (vv. 79—87). This lion is the poet's symbol for Spain—Aragon. Next he beholds a crowned eagle, ready to make a dash for him (vv. 88—97; this represents Emperor Maximilian). Next he beholds a proudly strutting cock (vv. 98—109, the symbol of France); next, a winged lion (vv. 110—134, the symbol of the Republic of Venice). Presently he beholds an ox that is led hither and thither by cats (vv. 134—146; this is Switzerland, drawn into all sorts of alliances by her "pensioners"). After the ox comes a wild bear with a ring in his nose (vv. 147—158 = the Abbot of St. Gall, who looks dangerous to Swiss patriots, but is harmless). Finally, Theseus sees a number of dogs wandering about aimlessly (vv. 159—164; these are the confederate cantons of Switzerland). Theseus now meets the Minotaurus, throws what remains of Ariadne's ball of thread into the jaws of the beast, and then dispatches the monster with his sword (vv. 165—196). If Zwingli himself had not added the interpretation of his weird poetic vision, it would have been difficult to understand his intention, unless the educated reader were to assume that it was to display the author's knowledge of antiquity and power of imagination. Zwingli tells us that the Labyrinth represents this life with its worry and toil and perplexing situations (*notabene*: such as confronted the Swiss people at the time). Theseus is the upright man, who has the strength and courage to rise in defense of the right (*notabene*: any one may claim this distinction, Zwingli not excluded). The animals in the poem stand for shame, sin, vice, in whatever form (*notabene*: these vices may be traits of particular nations). The thread of Ariadne represents Reason, which guides man unerringly in the paths of duty; and finally, the maiden Ariadne symbolizes the reward of virtue (vv. 197—210). The poem concludes with an application of wider scope, in which these thoughts are developed: All the world is gone astray from the teaching of Christ. What do the Christians of the time still retain of Christ beyond the name?

Therefore, let all the readers of this poem strive to enter into its deeper meaning: let them abandon their vices, their greed, etc., and adopt—better manners (vv. 211—272).<sup>2)</sup>

“The Labyrinth” was followed in the same year, before October, by the other allegory, which is usually referred to under the caption “The Ox.” Behind stout fences a fine ox is grazing in a beautiful, well-watered meadow (vv. 1—14). Sly cats are leading the trusting ox about at their will (vv. 15—24). A faithful dog, Lyzikus, always gives the ox a warning bark when he is about to be led into danger (vv. 25—36). The ox is attacked by a lion and other beasts, but conquers every one of them (vv. 37—42). Since the animals are not able to conquer the ox, they resort to a stratagem: they send a leopard, who gives the cats nice things to feed on, and while they feast, he addresses the ox, praising him for his wonderful strength and marvelous victories, and inciting him to still greater deeds that are to amaze the world (vv. 43—56). Here the dog barks vehemently, but the cats are leading the ox after the leopard, who takes him wherever there is hard and rough work to be done, and the ox does it (vv. 56—70). The lion, jealous of the leopard’s powerful ally, proposes to the ox an alliance with himself (vv. 71—80). The cats, afraid that they will lose the dainties which the leopard is furnishing them, urge the ox to decline the lion’s offer (vv. 81—93). The ox obeys; and the lion in a rage now prepares to undo the ox; he forms an alliance with the leopard, and the two begin to terrorize all the other animals (vv. 94—119). The fox, who has been maltreated by them, goes to make complaint to the shepherd, and receives from him the promise of aid (vv. 120—138). The shepherd now pleads with the ox to submit to his guidance, and the ox promises to obey; the dog gives a joyful bark (vv. 139—152). The ox now follows the lead of the shepherd, but the cats are longingly looking back in the direction of the leopard, and make also the ox look back (vv. 153—158). The lion and the leopard now declare war upon the ox for having

2) Zwingli’s Works, ed. Schuler and Schulthess, Vol. II, II, 243—256.



allied himself to the shepherd (vv. 159—168). Now follows an Epilog by a goat, that wonders whether the ox must not finally succumb to the combined onslaught of the lion and the leopard. He surely will, if the shepherd does not protect him. If only the cats would not always try to lead the ox back to the leopard! If they should succeed, let the ox be afraid of the shepherd! (vv. 169—202.) In the concluding lines Zwingli introduces the *denouement* of his allegorical characters: the shepherd is the Pope; the dog is any faithful Swiss priest (*c. g.*, the pastor of Glarus); the lion is the emperor; the leopard, the French king; the ox, the Swiss people; and Zwingli leaves you to guess who the cats are.<sup>3)</sup>

The allusion to the Pope under the pleasing image of the shepherd of the nations, particularly of the Swiss, brought Zwingli material reward. The Roman Curia, ever observant of rising genius and power in any part of its domain, had discovered efficiency in Zwingli that could be made subservient to its interests. Pope Julius,—the particular shepherd of Zwingli's fable,—whom to denominate shepherd is the worst *lucus a non lucendo* imaginable, placed Zwingli on the papal pension-list with an annual allowance of 50 gulden, "for the purchase of books," which was a pellucid euphemism for being a papal agent. The editors of Zwingli's works remark that this was frequently done to "the most prominent agents" to attach them to the Pope's interests. In 1523 Zwingli had come to feel the ignominious *role* which he had played at one time. In his *Auslegen der Schlussreden* he remarks: "I admit my sin before God and all men; for prior to 1516 I still clung rather much to the sovereignty of the Pope, and thought that it was proper for me to accept money from him, although I always told the Roman messengers in plain words, when they admonished me not to preach anything contrary to the Pope, that they must not hope that I would omit a single word of the truth for the sake of their money; and so they might take their money back

3) Zwingli's Works, Vol. II, II, 257—268.

again or leave it. — I am speaking before God, the Judge of all men, (and declare) that aside from this instance I have received no pension or hire from any prince or lord, nor have I been financially beholden to any one in any way.”<sup>4)</sup> It is the later Zwingli that is here speaking, and we can feel his keen regret over his former mistake, and admit the genuineness of his sorrow. But we cannot, withal, extend the force of the reservation which he has woven into his confession to all his transactions with the papal messengers. At the time he wrote “The Ox,” he was in no frame of mind to make such a statement to them, and it is doubtful whether that statement was ever made while he was at Glarus; it may possibly have been made during the last year of his pastorate. But what was the moral worth of the statement if it was made at any time as long as Zwingli took the money? While he was denouncing “pensionaries” as traitors to the country, he was himself the Pope’s “pensionary.” As we shall have to refer to this matter in connection with later events at Zurich, we defer further remarks here.

After October. Luther lectures on Aristotle at Wittenberg.	1508	
March 9. Luther becomes a Bachelor of Theology.	1509	
Fall. Luther returns to Erfurt to lecture on the Sentences of Lombard.		
November. Luther starts for Rome.	1510	Zwingli at Glarus, writes “The Labyrinth” and “The Ox.”
End of February. Luther back at Erfurt.	1511	
May. Luther has returned to Wittenberg.	1512	
Pentecost. Luther at Cologne, attending chapter of Augustinians.		Zwingli accompanies the Glarean contingent of soldiers to Italy as chaplain.
October 4. Luther becomes Licentiate of Theology.		Zwingli describes the campaign of the Glareans.
October 18. Luther made a Doctor of Theology.		
October 21. Luther received into the theological senate. Staupitz resigns.		

4) Works II, II, 243 f.

## MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST.

## SEVENTH OUTLINE.

*THE SECOND TABLE. Qu. 36. 37.*

Luther has called the First Table the right, the Second the left. (10, 151.) The idea is, that we are surrounded on all sides with manifestations of the divine will. It is the same God who addresses us in the last seven as in the first three commandments, and we serve Him still when we comply with the Law of the Second Table. The injunctions and prohibitions laid down in the Second Table create duties just as solemn, as those in the First. The Second Table is not inferior to the First, as regards dignity of origin, nobility of aim, and practical usefulness. It differs from the First only in this respect, that it has to do with beings inferior to God. "The First Table is above the Second, and God is superior to the creatures. Accordingly, when a situation arises where a person has to renounce either God or a creature, he must renounce the creature rather than God. Inasmuch as the commandments in the Second Table relate to the creatures, we must let the creatures slip, and this Table must yield when it conflicts with the First. This should be borne in mind over and against our present devils, who are shouting: We must listen to the Church and to the government, over and above the Holy Scriptures and the Word of God, and in opposition to it. This is horrible madness, to place the Second Table ahead of the First, man or a creature ahead of the Creator, and to teach: The Church must be obeyed even when it commands something that is plainly against the Word of God. But this matter is settled by the passage, Acts 5, 29: 'We must obey God rather than men,' just as Christ says in this place [Matt. 10, 36]: 'I shall set the son at variance against his father,' that is, In the matter of obeying commandments I want to be preferred even to parents and all kings." (7, 108.) In loving and serving men, however, under the Law of the Second Table, we are still loving and serving God; we love and serve our neighbor along with God. "God grant that we take this to heart, and so regard our neighbor that any service rendered to him is regarded as if rendered to God. If this were done, the whole world would be filled with the worship of God. Servants in the stable, maids in the kitchen, boys at school, would all be servants and worshipers of God, if they would diligently do what father and mother, master and mistress, command them. Every home would be a real church, in which nothing but



divine service is conducted. (13 a, 906.) This teaching will lead to a very severe judgment on the last day. . . . The wicked, says Christ, will ask, 'When have we seen Thee hungry and thirsty?' and He will answer them; 'What ye have done to the least of these, ye have done unto Me.' . . . In many passages He has told the Jews that he does not need their gold, their temple, nor anything else, but if they would serve Him aright, He directed them to their neighbor." (*Ibid.*, p. 903—5.)

Luther has called attention to the fact that the subject-matters of the Second Table coincide with the contents of the ethics of natural religion. "The Second Table embraces the common life of men as viewed by reason. The philosophers who have written on the duties of man have very well explained this life, *viz.*, the Platonists, the Peripatetics, and the Stoics have all said that virtue is the highest good. Though they differ somewhat in their terms, they agree in the matter. They have been able to speak eloquently of this life of which the Second Table treats, because they retain only the definitions of the virtues." (22, 412.) The voice of paganism on the moral duties of man and on the virtuous life, when it speaks truth, is the voice of the unwritten law in the heart of man, and a corroborating witness to the Second Table of the Law. The ethics of natural religion, however, owing to the ravages of inborn sin, do not touch the deep matters contained in the Second Table. Also the *illuminatio legis* in heathen minds is a dim and insufficient affair, and requires reinforcement by means of the written Law. It is well, however, for the Christian teacher to remember that in explaining the duties of man under the Second Table he will find pagans saying many things that he is saying,<sup>1)</sup> and saying them oftentimes in a most beautiful and striking manner. Speaking of Seneca, Farrar says: "So nearly, in fact, does he seem to have arrived at the truths of Christianity that to many it seemed a matter for marvel that he could have known them without having heard them from inspired lips. He is constantly cited with approbation by some of the most eminent Christian fathers. Tertullian, Lactantius, even St. Augustine himself, quote his words with marked admiration, and St. Jerome appeals to him as '*our Seneca*.' The Council of Trent go further still, and quote him as though he were an acknowledged father of the Church."<sup>2)</sup> This is, of course, an extravagant view. It is significant of the trend of thought in the leaders of the Reformed Church, Zwingli and Calvin, that they

1) Thales has said: *Agapa ton plesion*, Love your neighbor. (Stobaeus, *Florilegium* III, 59 e.)

2) *Seekers after God*, p. 6 f.

began their literary career with a reproduction of Seneca's *De Clementia*. One need but examine "Seneca's Resemblances to Scripture"<sup>3)</sup> to become convinced that in spite of many coincidences there is a vast difference between Scriptural and natural ethics.

### I. The Biblical Meaning of the Term "Neighbor." Qu. 37.

A. Luther recognizes our need of instruction as to who is our neighbor.

"It is verily so that no man knows, except by the Spirit of Christ, either what God is, that is, how we must worship and show our gratitude to Him, nor what our neighbor is. For just as all men make themselves a god of their own, and never hit the right one, but become divided in innumerable forms of idolatry, so they are blind in this matter also: they never recognize their neighbor, although he is before their eyes. They may give alms otherwise and do many great works, but they allow him to pass unnoticed, and to suffer misery and hunger, when they ought to serve and help him." (11, 1564.)

B. In His summary of the Second Table, Matt. 22, 39, the Lord calls the object of that love which the entire Law inculcates simply by the general term "neighbor."

1. *Plesion* in the New, and *rea* in the Old Testament (Lev. 19, 18) have, first, a local meaning = he who is nearest to us, *proximus*, *vicinus*.<sup>4)</sup>

2. In Matt. 5, 43 *plesion* is the opposite of *echthron*, and evidently stands for "friend."

3. The meaning of the term is broadened, *e. g.*, in Acts 7, 27, where it plainly takes the meaning of the German *Mitmensch*, *Nebemensch*.<sup>5)</sup>

4. The idea of nearness is underlying all these meanings. Whether we regard a person as related to us by our common humanity, or by

3) *Ibid.*, chap. XV, p. 160 ff.

4) Our English term is derived from *neah* = nigh + *gebur* = inhabitant.

5) According to Cr  mer the signification of the term in classical antiquity is *quivis alius*, and the term is applied even to the defendant in a trial at court by the prosecutor. Cr  mer thinks that the meaning of the term has been deepened and rendered more intense by the Jewish notion that "neighbor" means compatriot and coreligionist. (*Woerterb.*, p. 883.) If this is a deepening, it has been repudiated by the parable of the Good Samaritan, which plainly extends the meaning of the term so as to embrace people of a different religion and faith.

ties of consanguinity and affinity, or by national, racial, and religious ties, he is in either one, or several, or all of those relationships our neighbor. "The Samaritan (in Luke 10, 25 ff.) thinks: Although I am not a Jew as he, still I am a man as he; we have one Creator. Therefore he is nearer to me than an irrational brute. I will not suffer him to lie there. Up with you, my brother, let me help you," etc. (13 a, 849 f. Comp. 13 b, 2327.)

C. The practical definition of the term "neighbor" which our Catechism offers has been gleaned from the parable of the Good Samaritan: Our neighbor is any person whom we find in distress. The starting-point for this definition lies in the work which the Second Table requires of us. Understanding that, we can easily determine the person in whose behalf we are to perform the work. It is like defining bread by saying: It is that which appeases hunger.

1. Does the parable of the Good Samaritan really support this definition? For the Lord applies the term "neighbor" not to him who received, but to him who rendered help. Luther answers this question: "It sounds strange to call him 'neighbor' who shows kindness and love to another. As a rule, we call him 'neighbor' who is in need of kindness, whom we must serve, and to whom we must show our love. And this way of speaking is also in accordance with Scripture, and comports with the tenor of this commandment. But both (he that does, and he that receives, charity) belong together, and Christ comprises both *in praedicamento relationis*. He wraps us all together, implying that one is the other's neighbor." (11, 1565.) <sup>6)</sup>

6) Very happily Cremer explains the peculiar application of *plesion* in Luke 10, 29 ff. thus: "When he with whom I just happen to deal is designated as my neighbor, or, rather, I am asked to regard myself as *his* neighbor in respect of my duty, I am asked to preserve and cherish the bond of fellowship, which moves him so closely to me *that I cannot separate myself from him*. . . . 'By the Christian view of universal love some civil expressions receive an additional religious meaning, which they could not have outside of Christianity. . . . *Thie nahiston* (superlative of *nah*) are in Old High German a person's neighbors in the community. . . . In this sense the term belongs to the Old High German language, and contains no reference to Christianity. However, when the Old High German expression *der nahisto* (= our *der Nacchste*) means as much as man, fellow-man, in general, this could occur only as an effect of a faith which declares all men brethren and neighbors. . . . For it was through the conception of Christianity, as Christ expressed it in the parable of the Good



2. The idea that a person's need constitutes him our neighbor appears also in Gal. 6, 10; for *pros pantas*, "unto all men," which indeed extends the scope of the term "neighbor" to the bounds of humanity, nevertheless is qualified by *ergazometha to agathon*: all men are our neighbors in so far as we may do them good because they need it. Thus the very attempt to obtain a Scriptural definition of the term "neighbor" leads to the conviction that what the Second Table inculcates is not the airy notion of universal fellowship, comradeship, altruism, human brotherhood, but hard, practical service. The definition is realized, if not found, in that service.

D. In settling the question, Who is our neighbor? Scripture, on the one hand, permits a distinction to be made, yea, it commands it; on the other hand, Scripture declares certain distinctions which men make inadmissible.

1. In Gal. 6, 10 those "who are of the household of faith" are singled out from "all men" as worthy of the charities which Christians extend to their neighbors. *Oikeioi* is our English "home-folks," and the accompanying genitive of quality, *tes pisteos*, indicates the origin of the relationship. "Paul might also simply have written *pros tous pisteuontas*; but the expression *oikeious t. p.* suggests a stronger motive. Among the *pasi*, in relation to whom we have to put into operation the morally good, *those who belong to the faith* have the chief claims—because these claims are based on the special sacred *duty of fellowship* which it involves—in preference to those who are *strangers* to the faith, although in respect even to the latter that conduct is to be observed which is required in Col. 4, 5; 1 Thess. 4, 12." (Meyer.) "Every man does good to his relatives; believers do good to their relations in the faith, especially to those who are entirely devoted to its propagation, v. 6. So the apostle commends faith itself

---

Samaritan, that the Old Testament expression received its world-embracing meaning.' R. v. Raumer, *Die Einwirkung des Christentums auf die alt-hochdeutsche Sprache*, p. 401. . . . This view of Raumer, however, needs to be supplemented. While Israel and its theologians never passed beyond the question regarding the scope, and, consequently, regarding the limits of the neighborly relationship, Christ teaches us to cast the question into a different form: Am I not in this instance the nearest person whose service is demanded? Luke 10, 36. Thus the scope of the concept 'neighbor' is not gained by limiting the object, but by a limitation which rests on the demand which in each instance is laid upon the subject. He is neighbor to me who has to depend on me, and for that reason I am his neighbor." (Woerterb., p. 883 f.)

in this passage." (*Bengel*.) The Christian religion does not abrogate the natural relationships into which men enter in this life, but ennobles them. "We are to do good unto everybody, to Gentiles and Jews, to grateful and ungrateful persons, to friends and enemies, to people closely related to us and strangers, in short, love, as we stated, is to be extended without regard of a person. Behold the great extent of Christian benevolence; for it must be full-orbed, as Christ says Matt. 5, 46: 'If ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?' But he gives the preference to our associates in faith, because we are attached to them by a closer bond, since they are from the same house and congregation, from the same family of Christ, having one faith, one Baptism, one hope, one Lord, and sharing all things with each other." (8, 1649.) Paul, then, does not advocate partiality in what he says, but points out how the general law is regulated by natural causes in particular instances.

2. Any distinction, however, which our selfish heart may make in determining who is our neighbor is rejected by Matt. 5, 44. 45.

a. In general, it makes no difference whether a person is morally *poneros* or *agathos*, whether he is civilly *dikaios* or *adikos*. Sinners and saints, upright men and crooks, are wards of neighborly love to us, even as they are wards of the Creator's preserving care. We are naturally drawn and prompted to extend help to persons in whom we recognize some merit, but this is not always, perhaps in the fewest instances, possible. The highest merit often goes unrecognized. It is, therefore, a most merciful rule that is here laid down, that makes even those whom we regard as evil and unjust fellow-beings who sit with us at the table which our heavenly Father spreads for all.

b. In particular, it makes no difference whether a person's relation to us is friendly. Personal enmity in all its manifestations makes it very hard for us to regard a person as our neighbor: he seems to decline all notions of relationship to us, and we are nevertheless to assert that relationship. But the law of love correctly embraces our enemies; for their enmity can never destroy a relation that God has established; their whole action against us is a continuous falsehood, an impossible repudiation of us, while what we do to them is truth, the assertion of an indestructible principle.<sup>7)</sup> — By the parable of the Good Samaritan the Lord enforced His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. He "reproves and rejects the hypocritical gloss of the

---

7) Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and most modern critics drop the words, "bless them . . . hate you." Meyer and others retain them. They occur uncontested in Luke 6, 27. 28.

Jews, who depict and locate their neighbor according to their conceit. They regard as their neighbor whom they like, that is, their friends, who well deserve their kindness, are worthy of their love, and from whom they have derived, and still hope to derive, benefits. They think that they are under no obligation to serve or help a stranger, persons unknown to them, unworthy, ungrateful persons, and enemies." "The Samaritan was neighbor to the wounded man, not the priest nor the Levite, though they should have been, being under the same obligation. For in this matter all men are under a mutual obligation, because they are all subject to the same God and have the same commandment: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor,' etc. Hence there is no difference as regards this duty, and the meaning of this incident is: Christ forces this hypocrite to acknowledge, in agreement with the common sense of all men, that people who, before God, belong together, one needing help and the other able to render help, are neighbors, and no one is excused or exempt from this duty, no matter whether he is a priest or a Levite." (11, 1564 f.)

## II. *Loving Our Neighbor.* Qu. 36.

A. All the duties which the Second Table imposes are, like those of the First Table, summed up in the term *agapan*, which denotes a love on moral grounds, coupled with high esteem and conscientious regard, and is distinct from *philein*, which expresses natural physical desire for a person. (See Third Outline, THEOL. QUART. XIX [1915], p. 21 f.)

1. The term *agapan* is expanded in Matt. 5, 44 by *eulogein* ("bless"), *kalos poiein* ("do good"), *proseuchesthai* ("pray for"). "Observe the *entire* love which is here required: *disposition, word, act, intercession.*" (Meyer.) Of these four notions, Bengel, from whom Meyer borrowed them, says: "The third is almost entirely contained in the first, and the second in the fourth." They are, in fact, all contained in the first. The love which we owe our neighbor must be cordial and active, calling forth ever new and ever greater efforts from us, and coping even with the greatest difficulties. *Agapan* never signifies mere feeling, a Platonic affection, an idealistic view of universal brotherhood. It is an energetic exertion of the powers of the intellect and will in the service of another. Rightly Wilke-Grimm paraphrase *phileion einai* thus: *officia amici et socii alieni praestare*, and cite Luke 10, 29 as proof. (p. 361.) "To act as a neighbor to



another is of two kinds: 1. only in name and with words; 2. by acts and in deed." (11, 1565.)

2. In Gal. 6, 10 the phrase *ergazesthai to agathon* ("do good") must, therefore, be treated as practically a synonym of *agapan*. Speaking of weak interpretations of this phrase, Meyer says: "The *morally good*, not the *useful*. Not merely the article, but also the use of the expression by Paul, in definite connection with *ergazesthai*, as applying to morality active in works (Rom. 2, 10; Eph. 4, 28), ought to have prevented the interpretation of *to agathon*, at variance with the context, as *benefits*. Hofmann's interpretation ('do good towards others'), in more general terms evading the definite idea, amounts to the same thing. The *agathon* in this passage is the same as *to kalon* in v. 9. That which is *good* is also that which is *morally beautiful*. Comp. especially Rom. 7, 18 f." *Kalos poiein* in Matt. 5, 44 has virtually the same meaning: it merely brings out more directly the quality of the *actor*, instead of that of the *act*.

3. Neighborly love must be constant. Not only must it be exercised under the varying and continuing conditions indicated in Matt. 5, 44, not only must it accompany its objects as long as there is need of serving them, as the action of the Good Samaritan shows, not only must it be ever recurring, prompt, and regular as the rising of God's sun and the falling of God's rain, Matt. 5, 45, but our whole life must be consecrated to it. "The specialty," says Meyer of Paul's exhortation in Gal. 6, 10, "lies in *hos kairon echomen*, which is therefore emphatically prefixed: *as we have a season suitable thereto*. This seasonable time will have elapsed when the *parousia* sets in; we must therefore utilize it as ours by the *ergazesthai to agathon*. The same idea as the *exagorazesthai to kairon* in Eph. 5, 16; Col. 4, 5." "It is as if he wished to say: Do good now while you may; for you will be surprised to note how the time is slipping away from you. Do not let such thoughts as these fool you: Ah, well, in a year, or in two or three years, I shall get to this business." (12, 929.) The text is weakened by an interpretation like this: whenever an opportunity is offered us.

B. Neighborly love has its standard of perfection fixed by the phrase *hos seauton* in Matt. 22, 39.

1. It is not to be raised to such a height as the love of God, which is to exceed our love of anything and everything else. Like ourselves, our neighbor is a creature, and cannot be honored like the Creator.

2. But, on the other hand, being a creature like ourselves, our love of the neighbor must not be inferior to the love we have for our-

selves. "Love must do away with the distinction between I and Thou." (*Meyer.*)<sup>8)</sup>

8) The popular idea that self-love is commanded by God finds expression in sayings like "Charity begins at home," "Everybody for himself, and God for us all," and in those vulgar phrases, "Look out for Number One," "Paddle your own canoe." It is a hoary error. "From the words of this commandment some fathers have evolved the notion that ordinate love begins with the love of self. For self-love, they say, is prescribed as a rule for your love of the neighbor. I shall merely express my opinion on this matter; it is this: My understanding of this commandment is, that it does not command love of self, but only love of our neighbor. Because, in the first place, self-love is already too firmly rooted and dominant in all men. Again, if God had intended to ordain self-love, He would have said: Love thyself, and, after that, thy neighbor as thyself. However, He says: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' that is, love him in the same manner as you are already loving yourself without any command to that effect. In this manner, too, the apostle in 1 Cor. 13, 5 predicates of love as a peculiar quality, that it seeketh not its own, thus utterly repudiating by these words love of self. In like manner Christ commanded men to deny themselves, and to hate their own lives, Mark 8, 35. In Phil. 2, 4 it is clearly stated that no one is to seek what is his, but what conduces to the welfare of others. Lastly, if man possessed a proper love of self, he would not now need the grace of God. For this very love, if it is of the proper kind, causes a person to love himself and his neighbor. Nor does the Law inculcate any love other than this. But, as I said, the Law presupposes that man already loves himself, and when Christ says, Matt. 7, 12: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you,' etc., He clearly shows that they already have inhering in them a concern and love for themselves, and He issues no command whatever regarding this matter, as you see yourself. Therefore, as I take it, it seems to me that the Law speaks of *perverse* love, which causes everybody to forget his neighbor, and to strive only after such things as are useful and advantageous to himself. This love becomes an ordered love when a person forgets himself and serves only his neighbor. We have an illustration of this in the members of our body, each of which, even at some risk to itself, serves the other. For the hand fights for the head, and receives injuries; the feet step into mud and dirt and water, in order to rescue the entire body. Moreover, by this interpretation of the commandment the affection for oneself and the inclination to seek one's personal advantage is dangerously nourished, while Christ meant to crush it utterly by this commandment. However, if I should ever have to admit that the love of self is here commanded, I should take a still higher ground, and say that such love is always false and wrong as long as it is self-centered, and that it cannot be good unless it goes without, entering into God, that is, my own will and my love of self must be entirely dead, and I must not seek to have

3. The most effectual and practical method for determining in a given instance what the law of love for a fellow-man requires is stated in Matt. 7, 12.<sup>9)</sup> "I would like to be loved in such a manner that, whenever I have done evil, I may be forgiven; but I fail to do the same to others. I notice that they are vicious in their dealings with me, and yet I must act as if I do not notice it, and continue loving them. That is what loving our neighbor means, and that is what the Lord accounts as of equal importance with the First Commandment." (7, 2458.) "A person should strive to be much more willing to share his goods with others than to desire theirs; for that is included in love, which is the fulfilling of the Law, viz., not only to abstain utterly from the neighbor's possessions, but to act as neighbor to others by sharing his own goods with them in every possible way. For, no doubt, everybody wishes to be treated thus himself, viz., that others share their goods with him, and nobody seeks to take away from him what he has, but is glad that he has it. As regards this commandment, which covers such intricate transactions, no

anything except the pure will of God accomplished in me, so that I am ready to die, to live, to any form of existence which my Potter, God, wants to give me. Human nature finds this hard, wearisome, and impossible. For then I love myself, not in myself, but in God, not in my will, but in God's will. And I would then likewise love my neighbor as myself; I would only wish and labor to have the will of God, not my own will, done. But I do not think that they have understood this commandment; nor is this commandment understood as speaking of love. Therefore I warn everybody to beware of these heathenish maxims and sayings: *Proximus esto tibi, Du sollst dir Naechste sein*; and: *Ein jeder fuer sich selbst, Gott fuer alle*, and the like, for they are false and perverted, as the commandment itself shows." (8, 1595.) "When Christ in Matt. 22, 39 tells us to love our neighbor as ourselves, He is, according to my opinion, speaking of that perverted and wrong self-love by which a person only seeks his own interest. This love cannot be corrected except by ceasing to seek one's personal interest and by consulting the neighbor's interest. That is the meaning of St. Paul when in Phil. 2, 4 he says: 'Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others,' and in 1 Cor. 13, 5: 'Love seeketh not her own.' In these words he plainly forbids self-love. Therefore the meaning of this commandment: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' seems to be this: You are loving yourself alone, and that is wrong; but if you would direct such love as you have towards your neighbor, you would love him aright. This becomes evident from the fact that He does not command a person to love himself, which He certainly would have done if self-love were good. But He finds self-love already existing, transfers it to another object, and thus makes it right." (18, 357.)

9) "The golden rule." *Stand. Dict.*, s. v. "golden."

better rule can be given than that in all his dealings with his neighbor every person should place before his eyes this word of Christ, which furnishes the spiritual interpretation of all the commandments: 'All things whatsoever,' etc. Matt. 7, 12, and the saying of Tobit, chap. 4, 16." (3, 1321.) "Everybody is thus disposed: when he is ill, he would like to see all men come to aid him. When I am a poor sinner, have fallen into disgrace, and have a burdened conscience, I would like to see all men come to comfort me, and to help me cover up my sin and shame. Accordingly, I must treat my neighbor the same way; I must not judge nor condemn him, but forgive him his trespasses, help him, advise him, lend and give to him, just as I would wish that others should do to me when I am in anguish and sorrow, misery and poverty." (11, 1285.)

4. To come back once more to the parable of the Good Samaritan which should be drawn upon throughout this catechization. Luther says: "Christ is a thorny and annoying speaker, because He assails the priests and Levites, that is, most holy people and peculiar servants of God, and raises, oh! what a charge against them by holding up to them for their shame and ridicule the Samaritan, whom they abhorred and loathed as a reprobate. Thus He shows that it is the way of the world that those who are the most prominent, and boast that they are keeping God's commandments, are teaching them to others, and ought to set a good example, in brief, those who are regarded as high, prudent, mighty, and the best people, have least love for their neighbor, especially for the poor, forsaken Christians, who are persecuted for the sake of God and His Word. For they regard only their own holiness, prudence, and great gifts; *they imagine that everybody owes them service; they do not consider that what they have has been given them by God for no other purpose than that they should place their holiness, wisdom, honor, and possessions at the service of the needy, unwise, sinners, and castaways.* Therefore, it is proper that this Samaritan is praised, to the everlasting disgrace of the priests and Jewish saints (also of this hypocrite in our Gospel-lesson), because he showed love and kindness to this wounded stranger (who, no doubt, was also a Jew), while his own priest, Levite, and doctor of the Scriptures suffered him to lie there in such misery and agony that, as far as they cared, he would have to die and perish." (11, 1566.) Query: How would the priest and Levite have wished to be treated if they had been in the wounded man's place?

C. The study of the Second Table will quicken in us the sense of our sinfulness and the need of the Savior. "Show me



a person who in his heart and soul is chaste or in any other way godly: there is none on earth. We find that we are inclined to anger, hatred, worldly lust, rather than to meekness and other virtues. Now, if I do not find a spark of such an inclination in me, everything is wrong; satisfaction has not been made to the Law. However, I find in me not only a spark, but a whole furnace full of the fire of evil inclination. For there is no love in my heart, yea, not in any of my members. Accordingly, I behold in the Law, as in a mirror, that all that is in me is under the curse and condemnation of God. For not a tittle of the Law can perish; all must be fulfilled, as Christ says Matt. 5, 18: 'I say unto you,' etc. Now, you do not find that you are doing with your heart and soul, with joy and rejoicing, what the Law demands of you. Hence you are damned and belong to the devil. Apply this to yourself. See that you first attain to this knowledge that you confess: I belong to the devil. . . . Our sophists did not consider this, but taught us that, if a person did what he could, God would aid him with His grace. They are blind leaders; they admit that man is quite unwilling to do anything good; still if he sets out to do it, though in a labored, grudging, and lazy manner, he is well off with God. Christ, however, teaches the contrary: we are to do all with our heart and soul, and are to be very ready to do it." "Whoever would like to understand properly and thoroughly why the Law does not save us, let him consider these two points of which the lawyer speaks, and let him diligently ponder what it means to love God with all the heart, etc., and our neighbor as ourselves. He will find what a difficult and impossible thing it is, unless the Holy Spirit is given us into our hearts by the Lord Jesus and His Gospel. It is easily said: I love God; for He does not come to us in person and does not require that we are at great expense and make great preparations for entertaining Him. Let us consider, however, how we are treating poor people, and we shall soon discover whether we love God." (13 a, 852; comp. 13 b, 2329.) D.

---

## EARLY ATTITUDE OF AMERICAN LUTHERAN SYNODS TOWARD THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

In his *Documentary History of the General Council* Dr. Ochsenford has embodied a sketch of the sentiments toward this new body which prevailed at the time of the General Council's First Convention at Fort Wayne among other Lutheran Synods of America. Because of its comprehensive character, and in view of the present movement towards union with the General Synod, from which the General Council separated at the time of its organization, we submit this sketch here to invite reflection. Naturally every Lutheran who has the consistent upbuilding of his Church in our country on the basis of our Confessions at heart takes a deep interest in the present movement to consolidate, in some practical manner, the various parts of the American Lutheran Church. The question which engages the attention of earnest men in our Church most is, whether this unification can be accomplished without spiritual loss. We believe that the method suggested at the time by the Missouri Synod was the correct one, and if adopted, might have brought results. — Dr. Ochsenford says:

### TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS.

The business before this newly organized body was, first, to ascertain the action of the several Synods in reference to the adoption of the Fundamental Principles and the Proposed Constitution. It is to be remembered that all the delegates of the various Synods that had participated in the Reading Convention the previous year had unanimously adopted these "Principles"; but they were instructed, at the time, to take them to their respective Synods, in order to have their action ratified by the Synods. So also the Constitution, the preparation of which they had authorized and the fundamental principles of which the delegates had adopted, was sent to the District Synods for examination and adoption. It had been agreed that if the Synods would ratify the action of their delegates and adopt the Constitution, they should be regarded as integral members of the general body thus provisionally organized. It was ascertained, at this first regular convention, that the Principles of Faith and

Church Polity had been ratified and adopted by the requisite number of Synods, and that the Proposed Constitution had also, in part, been adopted, though, in reference to the latter, a number of suggestions and proposed amendments were to be submitted in connection with the consideration and final adoption of the Constitution.

The Joint Synod of Ohio, except the English District, did not adopt the Constitution, for reasons which seemed satisfactory to that body, and therefore did not formally and fully unite with the Council, preferring to occupy, for the time being, the position prescribed in the Constitution. The German Iowa Synod subsequently assumed the same position because certain decisions of the Council were not satisfactory to the delegates. The Missouri Synod did not adopt the Constitution, and sent no delegates to this convention nor to any subsequent convention. Nor was the Norwegian Synod represented. It seems hardly possible that Synods whose representatives had so heartily and unanimously taken part in the adoption of the Fundamental Principles could hesitate to enter fully into this union of Synods, which they had so unanimously approved, on account of alleged irregular practises of individual Synods or of individuals within District Synods, into whose alleged irregularities the General Council had as yet had no opportunity or authority to inquire. Besides, one of the avowed objects of this new organization was to remove and prevent, as far as possible, all unscriptural doctrines and un-Lutheran practises, and to bring about, in all the Synods connected with it, true unity in doctrine and life. This ideal of true unity could not, however, be expected to be attained at once, but must necessarily be the work of years, especially in the older Synods, which, in their previous history, had been compelled to pass through trials and struggles and meet conditions with which the more recently organized Synods had had little or nothing to do.

The principal business of the convention, thus organized, was the important work of considering and adopting the proposed Constitution, which, beginning with the second session, occupied a large part of the time of this convention.

The delegation of each Synod represented was instructed to complete the committees on the English Church Book and the German Hymn Book, so that each District Synod would have a representative on each of the two committees.

The Executive Committee was instructed to report at the next regular convention, constitutions for both congregations and Synods to be recommended to such bodies as might in future be formed in harmony with the General Council. Provision was also made for the

preparation and presentation to the Council, at its next convention, an "Order of Business" and "Rules of Order," by the appointment of the following committee: Revs. J. A. Seiss, D. D., G. F. Krotel, D. D., and R. Adelberg, and Messrs. S. Gross Fry and Henry Lehman. Two additional officers were provided for, and the following were elected: Rev. B. M. Schmucker, English Corresponding Secretary; Rev. R. Adelberg, German Corresponding Secretary.

The basis of the representation of Synods in the General Council was fixed, and the ratio of representation incorporated in the Constitution.

The Committee on the English Church Book reported concerning the work done in cooperation with the Committee of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, and presented the conclusions reached as to the contents of the Church Book to be published for the use of congregations. A similar report was presented in reference to the German Hymn Book.

The Committee on Missions proposed a provisional plan for the prosecution of this important work of the General Council. Inasmuch as it is proposed to present these matters more in detail in subsequent chapters, they are merely mentioned here as items of business at this convention.

#### DIFFICULTIES CONFRONTING THE COUNCIL.

Notwithstanding the harmonious action of the Reading Convention in the adoption of the Fundamental Principles and an Outline Constitution, in which all the Synods represented at that convention heartily united, difficulties were presented at the very first convention, in reference to the practical application of those principles, which seriously interfered with the complete realization of the original plan of the founders of the General Council, and which for years proved a serious hindrance in the development and growth of the body. Although the discussions to which these difficulties led had the effect of causing the General Council to devote much time and attention to the great and fundamental principles of church unity on the basis of the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions, so that it is safe to say "that in no other Lutheran Body of the Old or New World has the question on the great principles of true church unity received such attention and been treated in such a thorough and comprehensive manner as within the General Council. And it seems to be a wonderful Providence that, on the very question in the treatment of which the differences of nationality and language frequently threatened to assume an undue prominence,



it was an English-speaking Lutheran who gave us the fullest and deepest utterances, and who dealt with the whole problem from the very center and foundation of the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Confession." 1)

In view of the relation which the Missouri Synod claimed it sustained towards different members of the General Council "in reference to doctrine and churchly practise," that body was led to keep aloof from the whole movement, and even the invitation to a free conference was declined. In the accompanying documents can be noted the contentions of the Joint Synod of Ohio and of the German Iowa Synods on various points concerning which these Synods were not entirely satisfied. Both Synods sent representatives to the first convention of the Council, but the former declined to unite with the body, and its delegates assumed only the privilege of the floor, whilst the latter at first occupied a place in the convention as an integral part of the body, but afterwards receded to the same position as that held by the Joint Synod of Ohio. This latter Synod, after the first convention, declined to have any connection with the Council, whilst the German Iowa Synod still maintains its connection with the body, which entitles its delegates to the privileges of the floor. The Joint Synod, through its delegates, laid before the convention the questions concerning the famous "Four Points," as will be seen from the accompanying document, which for years held a prominent place in the discussions of the General Council. The German Iowa Synod also asked for a specific declaration on three of the four points presented by the Joint Synod of Ohio, and because the Council's reply was not wholly satisfactory, the Synod could not see its way clear to become an integral part of the body. Following is the communication from the Joint Synod of Ohio,<sup>2)</sup> presented by one of its delegates, the Rev. F. A. Herzberger, on the

#### "FOUR POINTS."

To the Venerable General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America.

The undersigned, delegates of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and adjacent States, present the following to the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of (in) North

1) Dr. Spaeth, *The General Council*, Philadelphia, 1885, p. 27. The reference is to Dr. Krauth.

2) *Minutes of General Council*, Fort Wayne, 1867, pp. 11. 12.

America, in order that the Synod which they represent, as may be seen from the minutes of its last session, held in Hamilton, O., A. D., 1867, heartily desires a union of Lutheran Synods on the doctrinal basis as recommended by the General Council, and therefore sends its delegates to this Convention, in order to offer it the hand toward a true union.

But Synod saw practical difficulties in the way, on account of which, as well as for the want of a copy of the Constitution of the General Council, it could not yet instruct its delegates to consummate its connection with this body at its present session, nevertheless, in the meantime, cherishes the hope that the Lord will enable it, in the future, perhaps, to unite with other Synods to carry on the glorious work.

Under the above-mentioned difficulties, the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and adjacent States understands "un-Lutheran doctrine and practise, which, as experience teaches, despite the reception of the Confession, or 'Doctrinal Basis,' nevertheless is found to exist in some Synods."

The delegates of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio would therefore respectfully request the venerable General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America to favor us with information on the following points:—

1. What relation will this venerable body in future sustain to Chiliasm?

2. Mixed Communion?

3. The exchanging of pulpits with sectarians?

4. Secret or unchurchly societies?

Especially would we earnestly desire a decided answer with regard to the last item, inasmuch as the Joint Synod, for years already, in view of certain relations in one of its District Synods, has had difficulties in consequence of four pastors belonging to secret societies, and would not, therefore, again burden its conscience.

We pray that the Lord may overrule all to the glory of His holy name, and to the welfare of His Zion.

Respectfully, G. Cronenwett, F. A. Herzberger, G. Baughman.

#### THE COUNCIL'S DECLARATION.

This document, together with other papers handed in for consideration was referred to a committee, consisting of Revs. C. W. Schaeffer, D. D., C. P. Krauth, D. D., Prof. G. Fritschel, and A. Hoe-

necke, and Messrs. Thomas H. Lane, Fred Dauer, and Ed Roessler, which reported in the seventh session as follows, and whose report was adopted as here given:—<sup>3)</sup>

The Committee appointed to take action upon certain documents received, one from the Joint Synod of Ohio and one from the four District Synods of the Missouri Synod, respectfully report: That we have been impressed with the fraternal sentiments so freely conveyed in the said documents, and, after careful consideration of them, propose the following action:—

1. That the General Council rejoices that the Joint Synod of Ohio regards union with this body as an object of cherished hope, and regrets that the failure to receive our Constitution, with other difficulties, has prevented their union with us at this time.

2. That this Council is aware of nothing in its "Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity" and Constitution, nor in the relation it sustains to the four questions raised, which justifies a doubt whether its decisions on them all, when they are brought up in the manner prescribed in the Constitution, will be in harmony with Holy Scripture and the Confessions of the Church.

3. That so soon as official evidence shall be presented to this body, in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, that un-Lutheran doctrines or practises are authorized by the action of any of its Synods, or by their refusal to act, it will weigh that evidence, and, if it finds they exist, use all its constitutional power to convince the minds of men in regard to them, and as speedily as possible to remove them.

4. That inasmuch as the Synod of Iowa has offered a constitutional amendment, involving most of these same questions, we refer our beloved brethren of the Joint Synod of Ohio to the action which the Council has taken in their case, as their present answer in regard to these points.

In reply to the four District Synods of Missouri, we would recommend the following action:—

*Resolved*, That we hereby reciprocate the kindly expressions of the Synod of Missouri; that we sincerely respect the honest preferences of our brethren in regard to the best means of uniting our Church, and that we are willing to set apart a time, during the future sessions of this body, when it will meet them simply as a Free Conference.

---

3) *Minutes of General Council*, Fort Wayne, 1867, pp. 16. 17.

In the report of the committee, as just presented, reference is made to the following official document, referred to also by the President in his Report, from

FOUR DISTRICT SYNODS OF THE MISSOURI SYNOD.<sup>4)</sup>

To the President of the Evangelical Lutheran General Council in North America.

The members of the undersigned Synod, during its convention in Chicago, Ill., in May of the present year (1867), received a communication to the effect that the delegates of Evangelical Lutheran Synods, in the United States and Canada, assembled in Reading, Pa., have, among other matters, passed the following resolution: "That the Synods represented in this Convention which prefer a Free Conference to an immediate organization be and hereby are invited to send representatives to the next meeting, with the understanding that they have in it all the privileges of debate and a fraternal comparison of views."

We are, by no means, unmindful of the value of the privilege herein accorded to us by said Reverend Body, and the good intention which prompted this cordial invitation. But after having considered what position our delegates would occupy at the sessions of the Evangelical Lutheran General Church Council, we have arrived at the conviction that we dare not avail ourselves of so honorable a proposal. In view of the relation we sustain toward different members of the Church Council, in reference to doctrine and churchly practise, we must be apprehensive that the consideration and discussion of differences still existing in the Convention of the Church Council might give rise to the reflection that we intended to interrupt the bringing about of a unity, and are therefore fearful lest our participation, instead of leading to an agreement, might be productive of greater alienation.

Even at the risk of appearing capricious in the eyes of the Reverend Body, and less diligent in our efforts for churchly unity, we beg leave to declare it again as our conviction that Free Conferences, such as are separated from officially organized conventions of ecclesiastical bodies, on the basis of the Symbols of our Church, as contained in the Form of Concord of 1580, are the only proper means for an exchange of such convictions as are still divergent, and which, by the grace of God, may lead to a unity on the basis of our beloved Confession.

4) *Minutes of General Council, Chicago, 1869, pp. 29. 30.*



Hoping that our explanation may be received in the same sense in which it is given, and in the sincerity of our hearts, expressing our fervent wish that the Reverend Church Council may attain the object contemplated, and prove a blessing and consolation to the entire Evangelical Lutheran Church in this country, we look for a favorable reply to our renewed proposal.

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and  
Other States, the Western District, and in their name.

J. F. BUENGER, *Pres.*; G. S. LOESER, *Secy.*

Chicago, Ill., May, 1867.

In the name of the Northern District,

O. FUERBRINGER, *Pres.*; M. GUENTHER, *Secy.*

Adrian, Mich., June 26, 1867.

According to resolution and in the name of the Middle  
District,

H. C. SCHWAN, *Pres. pro tem.*; TH. WICHMANN, *Secy.*

Indianapolis, Ind., August 13, 1867.

In the name of the Eastern District,

E. G. W. KEYL, *Pres.*

Johannesburg, N. Y., August 24, 1867.

#### MISSOURI'S REPLY.

The resolution, which precedes this document in the present record, was communicated to the Missouri Synod. When the Council met at Pittsburgh, Pa., the following year (1868), no answer had been received. The secretaries were therefore specially instructed to bring this action of the General Council again to the attention of the Missouri Synod,<sup>5)</sup> in the hope that a conference with that body might be brought about, in accordance with what was understood to be its preference and wish. In answer to this action, an official communication was addressed to the President of the General Council, dated La Porte, Ind., October 12, 1869, in the following words:—

“To the worthy President of the General Council of the Evangelical  
Lutheran Church in America, Rev. C. W. Schaeffer, D. D.,  
Germantown, Pa.

“Reverend Sir:—Whereas, the Venerable General Council has  
issued an invitation to the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States,

---

5) *Minutes of General Council*, Pittsburgh, 1868, p. 26.



6. The Missouri Synod declines to take part even in such a Free Conference of unreserved adherents to the Augsburg Confession in any official way, and declares that any of its members who may attend such a Conference will do it "not as representatives," but simply as "individuals."

In view of these particulars, your Committee proposes the following resolutions:—

1. That, in the proposal made by the General Council to the Synod of Missouri, "to set apart a time, during the sessions of this Body when it will meet them simply as a Free Conference," it was believed that we were conforming to the wishes and views of our brethren of Missouri as previously expressed, and that it was our purpose to devote all necessary and reasonable attention to the topics in question, and to do full justice to the same, with an earnest desire to come to a mutual and right solution of all the difficulties hindering an organic union between this Body and the Synod of Missouri.

2. That we sincerely regret that the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, etc., has not been able to see its way clear to accept the proposal so heartily made to that Body, and that it has seen fit to decline all official dealing with this General Council, and even all non-official dealing with it in connection with its regular Conventions.

3. Although the Missouri Synod has thus decided to have no official correspondence with the General Council, still, in full confidence in the Scripturalness and the Lutheran character of the principles on which this Body is founded, that we hold ourselves in readiness to receive and entertain any proposals, in accord with our Basis, either from the venerable Synod of Missouri, or any others, looking to the much to be desired organic union of all true Lutherans in this country.

With this communication the Missouri Synod ceased all official intercourse with the General Council. The answer given by the Council to this communication from the Missouri Synod belongs properly to the transactions of a meeting subsequent to the convention of which we are treating in this chapter; yet for the purpose of presenting all these documents in a connected order, it is given in connection with the transactions of the first convention, especially in view of the fact that no other official relations between the two bodies are to be noted in the history of the General Council.

The German Iowa Synod also expressed dissatisfaction with

the answer given to the Joint Synod of Ohio, and, being requested to state its case in writing, presented to the General Council, at this convention, the following document, in which it states its case from its own point of view:—

#### PAPER FROM THE IOWA SYNOD.

In order to effect a union of the Church, and that we may all truly agree in the principles of practise as well as of faith, without conditions, the delegates of the Synod of Iowa propose, in accordance with the instructions of their Synod, that the General Council shall expressly acknowledge what is according to the understanding of the delegates of said Synod virtually acknowledged in the "Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity" adopted by this body, *viz.*:

1. That according to the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church there must be, and is, condemned all church-fellowship with such as are not Lutheran; for example, ministers serving congregations such as are mixed and not purely Lutheran, receiving such congregations and their pastors into synodical connection, the admittance of those of a different faith to the privilege of communion, the permission of those not Lutheran to occupy our pulpits, etc.

2. According to the Word of God, church-discipline be exercised, especially at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and be likewise exercised towards those who are members of secret societies.

3. That resolutions of church government by Synods in general and the General Council in particular, shall not be regarded as legislative, but only as advisory in their power over congregations represented in such Synods or General Council, inasmuch as these bodies can only have so much power as is delegated to them by the congregations.<sup>7)</sup>

This document was referred to a committee, composed of one delegate from each of the twelve Synods represented on the floor of the Council, which, in the eighth session, reported, "That the General Council is not prepared to endorse the declaration of the Synod of Iowa as a correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of our Confessional Books, and that we refer the matter to the District Synods, until such time as, by the blessings of God's Holy Spirit and the leadings of His Providence, we shall be enabled throughout the whole General Council and all its Churches, to see eye to eye in all the details of practise and usage, towards the con-

---

7) *Minutes of General Council, Fort Wayne, 1867, pp. 17. 18.*



summation of which we will direct our unceasing prayers." 8) The report was adopted, though five members of the Council received permission to record their names against its adoption, to wit: Revs. C. F. Welden, C. F. Heyer, John Bading, A. Hoenecke, and A. Martin. To this action the Iowa Synod replied through its representatives as follows:— 9)

#### STATEMENT OF THE IOWA SYNOD.

In reply to the decision of the General Council upon the application of the Synod of Iowa for the explicit avowal of certain principles of ecclesiastical practise, the undersigned delegation of the said Synod beg leave, respectfully, to present to the reverend Council the following explanation:—

In accordance with our deep and sincere conviction, which is at the same time that of the Synod we represent, we must declare it to be a necessary precedent condition of an official ecclesiastical connection between synodical bodies that there should be a complete and hearty agreement, not only in the principles of faith and confession, but also in an ecclesiastical practise accordant with such faith and confession, as set forth especially in the first of the propositions presented by us. Our Synod has therefore affirmed, in an official declaration presented to the reverend Council, that it enters into connection with the General Council only upon the presupposition that this principle, to the recognition of which it is bound by a sacred obligation of conscience, is officially acknowledged by all the Synods represented therein. It believes itself warranted in this presupposition by the Fundamental Principles of Faith and Church Polity proposed at Reading, because, in its understanding of the same, they really embrace the principle in question. But the declaration of the General Council, that it is not prepared at once to accept this principle, shows this presupposition to have been incorrect, and at the same time renders incomplete the contemplated

---

8) *Minutes of General Council*, Fort Wayne, 1867, p. 19. The report was signed by all the members of the committee, as follows: G. F. Krotel, for the Ministerium of Pennsylvania; C. F. E. Stohman, New York Ministerium; John A. Roof, English Synod of Ohio; W. A. Passavant, Pittsburgh Synod; A. Hoenecke, Wisconsin Synod; S. Fritschel, Iowa Synod; D. Worley, English District Synod of Ohio; S. Klingman, Michigan Synod; T. N. Hasselquist, Augustana Synod; G. Fachtman, Minnesota Synod; C. F. W. Rechenberg, Canada Synod; S. L. Harkey, Illinois Synod.

9) *Minutes of General Council*, Fort Wayne, 1867, pp. 33. 34.

connection of the Synod of Iowa. In this position of affairs the Delegates of the Synod of Iowa are constrained to forego the privilege of a vote in the General Council, and to withdraw to the position provided for in Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution. We do this with painful regret that it is not yet permitted to our Synod to labor together in the work of the General Council, in the union of a membership in the same, but at the same time with a joyful determination, within the prescribed limits, to walk and labor together with our esteemed and beloved brethren, as God may give grace, power, and opportunity. And we entertain the confident assurance that the day is not far distant when, by the grace and mercy of our God, the last hindrance to a complete union will have been removed. The principle maintained by us has not been rejected by the General Council, but acknowledged and confessed by many members, and even by some entire delegations. He who hath begun to bring us together in the unity of the truth will perform it. To Him and His good Spirit we commend the General Council, and the great work which lies before it. His blessing and His peace be with us all.

Signed by G. Grossmann, Sigm. Fritschel, Gottfried Fritschel.

#### ATTITUDE OF VARIOUS SYNODS.

On motion, this paper was received, the fraternal sentiments expressed most heartily reciprocated, and the hope expressed that the Council would have the pleasure of meeting, from time to time, in Free Conference, with the brethren of the Iowa Synod. The fact that the Iowa Synod felt compelled to assume this position was regretted by many members of the Council.

Whilst, on the one hand, the position assumed by the Iowa Synod, as well as by the Joint Synod of Ohio, in the declarations and statements presented in the preceding pages was not at variance with the principles adopted by the Council, it was, on the other hand, not well taken at the time, and it need not surprise any one that the General Council was "not prepared to endorse the declaration of the Synod [of Iowa] as the correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of our Confessional Books." An analysis of the reply made by the Council calls attention to the fact that the body was holding its first regular convention, and had not yet had time to inquire into, or regulate, all the practises and usages of the Synods represented on its floor at that time. The Synods should have been willing to allow time for proper and careful inquiry into the difficulties which they presented, and should have been

willing to cooperate with the Council in correcting such abuses as might be found to exist. Their complaints were made only in a general way, and were therefore vague and uncertain. If they had fully united with the Council and cooperated with it, they could have assisted in laying bare the abuses of which they complained, and then, and then only, had they a right to insist on their correction. In the light of nearly half a century after the formation of the General Council, it appears that these complaining Synods were hasty in their demands for something to be done immediately which could and, no doubt, would have been done in the process of time.

The Council was right in declaring itself unable to endorse the declaration as a correct logical deduction and application of the negative part of the Lutheran Confessions. The Lutheran Confessions condemn error wherever found, in or outside of the Lutheran Church; and they teach that "to the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere." (Augsburg Confession, Article VII.) Where men err, they are to be admonished, their mistakes are to be corrected, if possible, and only when errorists and evil persons refuse to hear the Church are they to be separated from the Church. The difficulty lay in the fact that some Synods demanded that that should be done at once, regardless of consequences, which others felt could be done with much better results by following an educational method, leading in the process of time all the Synods and congregations, among many of which in certain portions of the Church there existed peculiar difficulties, to the same lofty eminence of purity in doctrine and in practise, and so to true unity in both. The older Synods had difficulties in this respect, of which the more recently formed Synods had no true conception. These difficulties could not be eradicated at once and by the fiat of any organization; but as they had grown up gradually, so they must be removed by a process of education.

The discriminating statement of Dr. Spaeth, in reference to the whole situation, deserves a place here. He says, in his pamphlet on the *General Council*: "There appeared at this point a wide difference, especially between the Eastern and Western Synods, which was in the first place the natural result of the historical development, through which those various sections of the Church had passed which now endeavored to form an organic union. The Lutheran Church in the Eastern part of our country, having been founded about one hundred and fifty years ago, had passed through all the

different stages of church life, suffering, and death by which the history of the Church and Theology of the German Fatherland was characterized in that period. We need not be surprised to find that during this time many things had crept in which were in conflict with the spirit and confession of our Church. Over against those things the renewed appreciation of the Lutheran Confession and the honest return to the same was of comparatively recent date. It was therefore not to be expected that there should have been on all sides at the very outset a thorough insight into all the consequences and obligations of a decided and consistent adoption of the Lutheran Confession. On the other hand, most of the Lutheran Synods of the West had been founded at a much more favorable season. Out of the very fulness and freshness of the revived Confession, partly even in the martyr-spirit of a persecuted Church, have their foundations been laid and their structures raised. Accordingly, their whole congregational life could much more easily and more consistently be organized on the principles established in the Confession, and many evils could be excluded which in other places had taken root and had been growing for nearly a century."

It must not be forgotten, however, that the General Council, recognizing these and other difficulties, had made provision in its Constitution for the discussion and adjustment of all matters that might arise from diversity of views on the part of any of the Synods or individual members of the body. The Council offered full organic union to those who should be ready to adopt the Constitution and unite on its Fundamental Principles. At the same time those Synods that desired further discussions of doctrinal and practical questions, in order to attain a fuller agreement before finally uniting with it, were to be given an opportunity to remain in the nearest possible relation with it on constitutional ground and with constitutional privileges. The German Iowa Synod availed itself of this privilege, and has met, more or less regularly, with the Council since the formation of the latter body. The history of the past shows "that the General Council has always made the most liberal use of this power, thus giving even to those that were not yet organically united with it almost unlimited liberty to make themselves heard in its discussions, and to throw their influence into the scale wherever the votes were rather to be weighed than counted. The General Council could well afford to grant such liberty without grudging. For in this manner it only gave expression to its confident hope that upon the good foundation which had been laid a solid structure might safely, though slowly, be built, and that the pure confession



of the Fathers, having once been honestly and unreservedly adopted, would virtually prove itself the power of molding the whole life of the Church, whenever its principles should be fully understood and faithfully carried out." 10)

A glance at the history of the years immediately preceding and following the formation of the General Council shows this to have been a period of more than ordinary interest and importance to the Lutheran Church in America. It points first to a series of events that led to considerable shiftings in synodical and congregational relations. The withdrawal of the Pennsylvania Ministerium and other Synods from the General Synod in 1866 and the organization of the General Council in 1866 and 1867 were the cause of a disintegration of Synods and congregations, which resulted in a readjustment of both synodical and congregational relations in the course of a number of years. When the New York Ministerium withdrew from the General Synod, a number of pastors and congregations left the Ministerium and formed the New York Synod, which, in turn, joined the General Synod. A minority of the Illinois Synod organized the Central Illinois Synod, and united with the General Synod. In 1867 ten ministers and seven laymen withdrew from the Pittsburgh Synod, on the ground that in adopting the Principles of the General Council the Synod had violated its Constitution, and the seceding party claimed the name of the Synod, and as such was recognized by the General Synod. The Pennsylvania Ministerium also lost some of its pastors and congregations, which united with the East Pennsylvania Synod, a member of the General Synod. A similar statement applies also to the Central Pennsylvania Synod, which received a few Pennsylvania Ministerium congregations.

On the other hand, pastors and congregations in Philadelphia and the neighborhood, hitherto belonging to the East Pennsylvania Synod, united with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, the English Church at Fort Wayne, in which the battle of 1866 had been fought, entered the Pittsburgh Synod of the General Council, and others in various parts of the country readjusted their synodical relations by uniting with synods of the Council. In other portions of the country, congregations were divided, one portion uniting with Synods of the General Council, and others with those of the General Synod, while troublesome and expensive lawsuits were carried on by rival claimants for the property.<sup>11)</sup> This was the beginning of readjust-

10) Dr. Spaeth's *General Council*. Philadelphia, 1885, p. 25.

11) *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*, by the Rev. Dr. H. E. Jacobs, New York, 1893, p. 467.

ment in synodical relations and operations. The result within the General Synod was the weakening of the synodical and the strengthening of the general organization. "From that time,"<sup>12)</sup> says Dr. Jacobs, "the District Synods have little significance, and the interest is almost entirely centered in the General Synod. When compared with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, the General Synod is one synod, the District Synods corresponding to the conferences of the mother-synod. The difference of theory as to the relations of the General Synod to its districts also involves a different conception of the relations of the Synods to the congregations. The doctrinal differences with respect to the relation to the Augsburg Confession bore a very important relation to the controversy. But this issue was not separated from that pertaining to church-government, and the mingling of the two questions seriously affected the result." From the point of view of the General Synod, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania had been guilty of insubordination in refusing to recognize the higher authority of the general body. At Fort Wayne the majority stood for a centralization of power in the General Synod, whose decision, as the ultimate court of appeal, was to be final, and to this decision the District Synods were to submit.

The General Council, on the other hand, was organized on a less centralized basis, allowing its District Synods larger freedom in their individual spheres of activity. The sphere of the general body was conceived to be rather that of unifying all the particular parts of the body in the doctrines of the Church, providing a common form of service for all the congregations, and engaging in such general operations as the Synods might delegate to it, especially in the sphere of missions.

From the account in this and the preceding chapter it is evident that the plan of a general union of Lutherans, who held to a strict interpretation of the Augsburg Confession and accepted all the Lutheran Confessions, was still far from being realized. With the large Missouri and Norwegian Synods, both of which were represented at the Reading Convention, standing wholly aloof from the Council, the withdrawal of the Joint Synod of Ohio at the first convention, and the German Iowa Synod assuming a semi-official relation to the body, the prospects, at this first convention, for a general union of Synods, such as had been hoped for at the inception of the movement, were anything but bright. Besides, the questions thrust upon the Council by the Ohio and Iowa Synods led to conten-

---

12) *History, etc.*, p. 469.

tions within the body, which at times threatened to disrupt the organization. But the result of the protracted discussion of these questions was that the Synods of the Council learned to understand each other better, and enabled them to work together in greater harmony. Although the Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Michigan Synods, in the course of years, withdrew from the Council on account of the questions involved in these discussions, the General Council made rapid progress. The result of its varied activities has been a normal growth, so that at present the General Council is the second largest of the general bodies of the Lutheran Church in North America.

D.

## THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

### THE LORD'S PRAYER.

#### PRAYER IN GENERAL.

(Continued.)

Ps. 27, 8: *When Thou saidst, Seek ye My face, my heart said unto Thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek.*

A closer rendering of the text shows that Luther's translation surpasses that of the Authorized Version, in that it hits the sense of the original admirably. Luther: "Mein Herz haelt dir vor dein Wort: Ihr sollt mein Antlitz suchen. Darum suche ich auch, Herr, dein Antlitz." The order of the Hebrew is: "To Thee hath my heart said (when Thou saidst), 'Seek ye My face'; Thy face, Jehovah, will I seek." The parenthetical clause, "when Thou saidst," is not in the original, but it helps to make the meaning clear.

"Seek the Lord and His strength, seek His face continually"—this was the command given by David to his people, when he set up the ark in the holy Mount of Zion. 1 Chron. 16, 11. The figurative expression, "Seek ye My face," was God's command to come into His presence, to get audience with Him, to commune with Him, to pray to Him. Ps. 91, 15. This

command, "Seek ye My face," gave David courage to supplicate God in the hour of distress. In times of affliction and despondency, when the Evil One, in order to cast us into deeper gloom and finally into despair, assails us with thoughts of our unworthiness to seek God's face in prayer, we should plead this command, "Seek ye My face," in spite of the devil, as our warrant for coming to Him.—This David did. Circumscribed, the text says: Because Thou, Jehovah, who hast made a covenant of grace with Thy people, hast said: "Seek ye My face," therefore, I, David, will overcome all fears and doubts arising in my heart, and make bold to come into Thy presence. Thou hast commanded me to pray to Thee; to Thee I will pray, "Thy face, Jehovah," Thou gracious God, "will I seek."

*Matt. 7, 7. 8: Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.*

God only can give the gifts we need for body and soul, but He wants to be asked for them in prayer. Knowing how timid we oftentimes are to ask boldly, our Savior takes great pains to encourage us to pray. He condescends to make gracious invitations and precious promises. Such we find in our text.

*Ask—seek—knock!* "Each of these terms used presents what we desire of God in a different light. We *ask* for what we *wish*; we *seek* for what we *miss*; we *knock* for that from which we feel ourselves *shut out*. Answering to this threefold representation is the triple assurance of success to our believing prayer." (J. F. and B. Com.)—We observe that the promises are here unqualified: "*Ask, and it shall be given you,*" etc. But we must remember the Lord instructs His disciples, Christians. It is, therefore, presumed that they ask aright—in faith, according to God's will. 1 John 5, 14.

*Ask—seek—knock!* Sometimes, for reasons known to Him only, our Father does not answer our prayer immediately.



What are we to do? *Ask—seek—knock!* The fervor of our prayer must grow more and more intense—this is implied by the climax: ask—seek—knock. The woman of Canaan, Matt. 15, 23 ff., understood this art. She was in great distress owing to her daughter's being possessed of a devil. She cries unto the Lord for mercy. He answers her not a word. His disciples intercede for her—without avail. She renews her prayer, "Lord, help me." She is repulsed brusquely: the children's bread must not be cast to a dog such as she is. Her faith is sorely tried. Nothing daunted, she turns the tables on the Lord, as it were, saying: I grant I am a dog, on a dog's right I insist—to eat the crumbs which fall from the master's table. Jesus is conquered by that importunate asking, seeking, knocking, flowing from faith in His mercy, and He exclaims in wonderment: "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt." "And her daughter was made whole from that very hour."

Have we trials and temptations?  
Is there trouble anywhere?  
We should never be discouraged,  
Take it to the Lord in prayer.

Ps. 145, 18, 19: *The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him, to all that call upon Him in truth. He will fulfil the desire of them that fear Him; He also will hear their cry, and will save them.*

What a strong encouragement to prayer this beautiful passage affords! Four times—in climactic order—the assurance of divine help is made to Christian cross-bearers who cast their care upon the Lord.

The Christians' needs are many. God is their Helper; they "*call upon Him*," they pour out a prayer into His ears. They call upon Him "*in truth*," i. e., sincerely, with confidence that He will hear; for the *Lord* unto whom they pray is *Jehovah*, who has made a covenant of grace with them. The Christians who thus call upon the Lord also "fear Him"; they

approach the throne of grace not only with confidence, but also with a filial fear, with profound reverence; their prayer, both as to form and contents, moves within the confines of the Word of God.—Such are the suppliants; such is the nature of their supplication. They are to know and firmly to believe: 1. *“The Lord is nigh unto them”* with His gracious presence. 2. *“He will fulfil their desire”* since they prayed according to His will. 3. *“He will hear their cry.”* The prayer of the children of God in which they lay their needs, their wants and necessities, before Him in childlike faith, assumes the character of a loud cry in the ears of Jehovah. This He cannot and will not overhear. He will answer it; 4. *“He will save them,”* succor them. Though help may sometimes be delayed, come it will. Here is His fourfold promise. Though the answer may not be exactly as we expected it to be, still answer our prayer He will when His time has come, and in a way far superior to our thinking, in a way that is for our good.

Ps. 50, 15: *Call upon Me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me.*

Daily Christians call upon the Lord. But in the Christians' life there are oftentimes dark days, *“days of trouble,”* in which the waves of adversity and calamity rise to such a height as to threaten to engulf them. At such times the devil suggests: Don't pray; it is useless; God has become your enemy; He will not hear you. The devil is a liar. God says: *“Call upon Me”* in just such *“days of trouble.”* He promises: *“I will deliver thee.”* What an incentive to cry unto Him from the depths of our hearts! And when divine help has come, as it surely will come in one form or another, let us not forget to *glorify* His holy name. )

*“Call upon Me”*—this is the divine command; *“I will deliver thee”*—this is the divine promise; *“thou shalt glorify Me”*—this is the Christian's duty and privilege.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

## BOOK REVIEW.

*ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.* Edited by James Hastings. With the assistance of John A. Selbie, M. A., D. D., and Louis H. Gray, M. A., Ph. D. Vol. IX: Mundas — Phrygians. 911 pages.

The 284 articles in this volume, which is, like its predecessors, especially rich in ethnographical, anthropological, and ethical material, were written by 193 authors, of whom 133 are from the British Empire in all parts of the world, the majority from England and Scotland, 33 Americans, 10 Frenchmen, 6 Germans, 3 Japanese, 2 each from Holland and Belgium, 1 each from Italy, Russia, Sweden, and Switzerland. At least five of the contributors are Jews and an equal number Roman Catholics.

The theologian will find matter that attracts his attention in nearly every article; for in the study of countries, races, and tribes that come under review in this volume the subject of their religion is fully treated, and if they have come under Christian missionary influence, the changes wrought among them are noted. In the discussion of ethical concepts, like Nationality, Patriotism, Neutrality, Philanthropy, Patience, Peace, the religious element is dominant. Philosophy and theology have been related to each other in all ages, and the proper delimitation of the sphere of each has been the *crux* of every age. Accordingly, not only the composite article on Philosophy, pp. 844—887, but also such articles as that on New Thought, Nomism, Personalism, Pessimism, Perception, Nihilism, Nihilianism, Panpsychism, Naturalism, Ontology, Neo-Cyneism, Neo-Hegelianism, Neo-Kantism, Neo-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, Ontogeny and Philogeny, etc., are replete with matter that has a direct bearing on the study of the theologian. The same holds good of such biographical and critical articles as Ninomiya Sontoku, Pascal, Newman, Nahmanides, Nietzsche, Philo Byblius, and Nasir Ibn Khusran. Religious movements and tendencies, more or less distinct, within and outside of Christianity are treated in the composite articles on Music, pp. 5—61, Mysteries, pp. 70—83, Mysticism, pp. 83—117, Names, pp. 130—177, Nature, pp. 201—254, Pantheism, pp. 609—620, Persecution, pp. 742—769, and in the articles on Nonconformity, Pharisees, Odd-Fellows, Nabataeans, Nazirites, Perfection, Phallism, Papacy, Nestorianism, Old Catholicism, Nicolaitans, Oxford Movement, Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, Petite Eglise, etc.

We note a few judgments expressed in this volume. In his very thorough and exhaustive article on Christian Music Herbert Westerly accounts for the palpable dearth of great compositions in American



church music by saying: "The weakness of the American non-liturgic churches is the want of a definitely authorized order of services. The great freedom of choice opens the way equally to the American Gospel-hymn (mostly fit only for shouting at a street-corner) and some tawdry operatic-like chorus from a modern Mass. 'Happy are the people who, like the Germans or the Scots, have inherited in the past generations such noble things as the chorales with their splendid tunes, or the metrical Psalms with their fine melodies from different quarters.' Musically speaking, there are great opportunities for American churches, if wisely guided." (p. 26.) Every word of this we subscribe. — H. A. A. Kennedy scouts the idea "that St. Paul's use of *mysterion* has any suggestion of an esoteric cult or ritual" (p. 73), but seems to admit (p. 74) that the term may in Paul's usage be applicable to the two Christian Sacraments, provided it is not taught that they work *ex opere operato*. — The attempt of Rufus M. Jones to explain Matt. 11, 27 as an evidence of Christ's mysticism ("Only a son knows a father; the way of inner love-experience is the only way to the secret. The primary feature of mystical experience seems to be the very warp and woof of Christ's inner life," p. 89) is far-fetched, and, besides, too sweeping; for it would make of every person a born mystic. The personality of Christ is altogether *sui generis*, and the text cited must be understood by means of the theanthropical character of Christ. — The article on Mysticism in the Roman Catholic Church, by Chapman, of the Palazzo San Callisto, Rome, is very informing, but too little critical. In the latter respect the parallel article on Mysticism in the Protestant Church, by Rufus M. Jones, compares, very favorably with, though it is much more condensed than, Chapman's. While Jones acknowledges an early mystic influence exerted on Luther by the *Theologia Germanica*, he points out that the cause of the Reformation prevented Luther from becoming lost in a mystic cloud-land. K. Grass's article on Mysticism in the Russian Church (even Gossner is numbered with the mystics) is the most satisfactory of the three articles on Christian Mysticism. — Moffat's study of Christian names, especially in the section on Puritan nomenclature, while fully bringing out the seriousness of the times, is full of involuntarily amusing detail. — Over and against the confident assertions of some "scientific" *Schwaermer* it is refreshing to note this statement of Tennant in his article on Natural Law: "We cannot dictate any laws to Nature with impunity, unless they already be her laws, *i. e.*, unless Nature be *gesetzmaessig*. . . . Thus, J. Dewar in an address to the British Association, 1902, said: 'It is only the poverty of language and the necessity for compendious expression that oblige the man of science to resort to metaphor and to speak of the laws of Nature. In reality he does not pretend to formulate any laws for Nature, since to do so would be to assume a knowledge of the inscrutable cause from which alone such cause could emanate.'



At the same time few men of science would regard the significance of a physical law as exhausted in its capacity briefly to summarize past observations. Laws certainly imply also the belief that their application extends to unobserved cases — *e. g.*, the future. They thus express probabilities, and have been compared to guide-posts, which tell us what to expect as a result of certain experiences. Laws state the relations of things, and these relations are generally believed to be constant. The validity of such belief cannot be demonstrated. It would require an *a priori* premise, and none such is forthcoming." (p. 199 f.) — T. Rees's article on Nature in the Christian religion should in the last division be reinforced by a reference to Schiller's article on Humanism and Watt's article on Humanists in Vol. V. — In Carver's sympathetic article on Negroes in the United States the work of Lutherans among the freedmen of the South is evidently considered a negligible quantity. — In Maclean's study of Nestorianism we find a disposition, also revealed by Luther, to exonerate Nestor from conscious heresy. (p. 327.) — Coleman's article on Cardinal Newman is almost a panegyric. It can hardly be said to do justice to the Gladstone-Newman controversy on the side of Gladstone. — Adency's article on Nonconformity is one of the best written in this volume, and helpful especially to American readers because it elucidates the rise of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches. — The Novatian movement in the early Church is correctly set forth in an article by E. W. Watson as a propaganda for purism. — W. Ernest Rees defends the retention of the Christian oath by the State, which we consider an anomaly. — E. Brabrook's article on Odd-Fellows is restricted to their organization in England. Incidentally we learn that in the present European war "it was estimated in 1915 that more than 100,000 members of the Manchester Unity were in the fighting line or in training" (p. 450), and that the organization is now wrestling with the problem of meeting its increasing mortuary assessments. — Herbert Thurston, in his article on the Holy Office (the Inquisition), confines his remarks to the history of the institution, and says nothing about the hideous principles underlying it. For a member of the Roman Church, which the author is, we imagine that it would have been possible to offer more complete statistics of the operations of the Inquisitions. He merely notes that Benrath has investigated cases in the sixteenth century, and has found "that there were 803 processes for Lutheranism, 5 for Calvinism, 35 for Anabaptism, 43 for Judaizing, 65 for blasphemy, 148 for the possession of heretical books, 199 for sorcery (involving more particularly sacrilege with consecrated hosts), 22 for perjury in Inquisition trials, 23 for grosser forms of immorality, 20 for clerical concubinage, 45 for contempt of religion, and 27 for disregard of the laws of fasting and abstinence." He admits that during this century

the Office was "very active, and created much popular resentment" in the Netherlands. "It was here that on the 1st of July, 1523, two Augustinian monks were burned — the first victims who suffered for Lutheranism — at the Grand Place of Brussels. It was on this occasion that Luther composed the hymn, or, more correctly, the historical ballad, beginning: 'Ein neues Lied wir heben an.'" (p. 454.) — In Maclean's article on Christian Ordination (of ministers) the Lutheran Church is all but ignored, and the author seems to justify this by the fusion of the Lutheran and Calvinist communities in Germany, which, in his view, it seems, has put the Lutheran Church out of existence for the rest of the world. — In Tennant's article on Original Sin the old question as to the exact meaning of *eph ho pantes hemarton* in Rom. 5, 12 is left unanswered, and the 14½ lines which the author devotes to the teaching of the Lutheran and the Calvinistic churches on this subject are an appallingly inadequate effort. (p. 562.) Why, the entire Reformation is embedded in the teaching of this doctrine, and the controversies which it excited! — In his article on Orthodoxy William A. Curtis reveals the unfriendly spirit of the modern mind in these words: "The Augustinian maxim, '*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*,' which meant so much for Newman and his school, is a sound and invaluable principle in religious apologetics, but it is a fond imagination that seeks to harness it to the exclusive service of any particular system, however imposing. Weight of numbers, length of time, width of diffusion, do tell heavily in favor of any doctrine, worship, or organization that is on its trial. That is beyond question. But other things are needed. Truth is not always on the side of the big battalions, length of days is not immune from error. Nothing is more universally diffused than sin and superstition. Christianity itself not only remains, but is still likely long to remain but one of a group of religions with millions for their following, and the *orbis terrarum* has not yet completed its judgment upon its orthodoxy, its soundness for all times, all tongues, and all climes. We base our assurance of its absoluteness and finality upon something deeper than its diffusion. So with orthodoxy, we are led to adopt a discriminating attitude towards its claims. We recognize the honorable nature of the principle which inspires its formulation and recognition. We appreciate the value of the evidence which even its excesses furnish to man's sense of power for good and evil which organized common opinion commands in the Church as in the State," etc. (p. 572.) All this does not touch the Biblical concept of correct and sound teaching and faith. — For lack of space we must forbear noting interesting matters in the articles on Nietzsche, Paul, Papacy, Pantheism, and Pelagianism. D.